

THE  
TRUE SPIRIT ~~4139. d. 1~~  
OF THE ~~X~~ ~~1 - 8~~  
METHODISTS,  
AND THEIR  
ALLIES,

(Whether other *Enthusiasts, Papists, Deists,*  
*Quakers, or Atheists*) fully laid open;

In an ANSWER

To Six, of the Seven PAMPHLETS,  
(Mr. LAW's being reserv'd to be consider'd  
by itself;)

Lately publish'd against

Dr. TRAPP's Sermons upon Being  
Righteous over-much.

By which it appears, that the said PAMPHLETS  
united make up one of the greatest Curiosities  
that even This curious Age has produced.

---

They have cast their Heads together with one Consent, and are  
confederate against thee. The Tabernacles of the Edomites,  
and the Ismaelites, the Moabites, and the Hagarens: Gebal,  
and Ammon, and Amalech; the Philistines, with them that  
dwell at TYRE; Assur also is joined with them; and have  
holpen the Children of Lot. Psal. lxxxiii. 5, 6, 7, 8.

---

LO N D O N :

Printed for LAWTON GILLIVER at Homer's Head in Fleet-  
street, and sold by T. COOPER at the Globe in Pater-Noster-  
Row. 1740.

(Price 1 s.)

THE  
TRUE SPIRIT  
OF  
METHODES  
IN  
CHRISTIANITY

BY  
JOHN COOPER,  
LATE MEMBER OF THE  
SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION  
OF THE GOSPEL AMONG THE  
PEOPLES OF ASIA.

WITH A HISTORY OF THE  
PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY  
IN CHINA, AND OF THE  
CHANGES WHICH HAVE  
TAKEN PLACE IN THAT COUNTRY  
SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF  
THE AUTHOR'S PREVIOUS WORK.



DR. JOHN COOPER, upon his return  
from China, has written this work  
as a continuation of his former  
work, which was published in 1770.  
It contains a history of the progress  
of Christianity in China, and of the  
changes which have taken place in  
that country since the publication of  
the author's previous work.

THE AUTHOR HAS BEEN A  
MEMBER OF THE BRITISH  
MUSEUM SINCE THE PUBLICATION  
OF HIS PREVIOUS WORK, AND  
HAS HAD MUCH OPPORTUNITY  
TO STUDY THE SUBJECT OF  
THIS WORK, AND TO MAKE  
FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS INTO IT.

THE AUTHOR HAS BEEN A  
MEMBER OF THE BRITISH  
MUSEUM SINCE THE PUBLICATION  
OF HIS PREVIOUS WORK, AND  
HAS HAD MUCH OPPORTUNITY  
TO STUDY THE SUBJECT OF  
THIS WORK, AND TO MAKE  
FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS INTO IT.



## The true Spirit of the METHODISTS, and their ALLIES, &c.

**O**F the six Pamphlets \* lately publish'd against Dr. Trapp's Sermons upon being Righteous over-much, two have been already taken notice of in the Weekly Miscellany. The First (the weighty Mr. Seagrave's) was sufficiently consider'd in Numb. CCCXL. and some Strictures have been made upon a Second by another Hand in Numb. CCCXLV. To these Latter I shall make large Additions; and then proceed to animadvert upon the four remaining Pamphlets.

The Second (the First to be here examin'd) has the following Title : *A Preservative against unsettled Notions, and Want of Principles, in regard to Righteousness and Christian Perfection. An Explanatory Sermon, &c. Being an Answer to Dr. TRAPP's four Sermons upon the same Text perverted against*

B

the

\* Mr. Law's makes a Seventh; but That is to be consider'd elsewhere.

the METHODISTS. To which is prefixed a serious Address to all the true Members of Christ's holy Church: Meaning by Those true Members our modern *Enthusiasts*, or *Hypocrites*, or Both, called by the ridiculous Name of *Methodists*; Them, and Them only. *A Preservative against unsettled, &c.* The Archness of an *Enthusiast* is a whimsical Sort of Idea; yet This, you must know, is a piece of sheer Methodistical *Wit*. Dr. Trapp's *Preservative against unsettled Notions, and Want of Principles in Religion* is well known: And how lucky was this Writer in That sharp Application of the *Title*; Thus shrewdly turning the Dr's own Words upon himself! The *former PRESERVATIVE* is said to have done some Good; This *latter*, I am sure, will do none. Dr. T. has written against Atheism, Infidelity, Popery, Protestant Heresy, Schism, Erastianism; against Immorality, Profaneness, and Debauchery; against Coldness, and Lukewarmness in Religion, and the Cause of God; He has taught the Necessity of being strictly *Christian* both in *Faith*, and *Practice*, &c. Can no Quarter be given him by this pretended Saint, because he now writes against Enthusiasm and Hypocrisy? What he says about the Dr's *mistaking*, and *perverting* his Text, shall be consider'd in its proper Place. At present I observe that his Title-page is adorn'd with

two Motto's, from two *very different* Prophets, Mr. *Whitfield*, and *Jeremiah*. The first is a most false and villainous Reflexion upon the Clergy: The second, intended to make the same base, and unchristian Reflexion, is in these Words; *Woe be to the Pastors, that destroy and scatter the Sheep of my Pasture, saith the Lord*, Jer. xxiii. 1. I here take notice, once for all, (it would be tedious to mention the Particulars) that This Writer, *Whitfield*, and the Rest of the Sect, (as it ever has been the way of Fanatics, and others who hate our Church) perpetually apply the Words of the true Prophets in Scripture against the false ones, to abuse all the *English* Clergy; all, I mean, in this present Instance, except those very few, (four, or five) of their own Faction; thus profanely railing in Scripture-Language, without the least Truth, or so much as Pretence of Proof; begging the Question, and taking That for granted which is the very Point to be made out.

In his Address to all the *true Members*, &c. he acknowledges the two Extremes, of Defect, and Irreligion, on the one hand, of Excess, and Fanaticism, on the other. Why then does he, in that frantic Manner, rave against Dr. T. whose Business it is to establish that Distinction, and shew the Mischiefs on *both Extremes*; tho' his Subject led him to insist chiefly upon  
one

one of them? There is indeed this difference; The Dr. points out those Excesses, and proves them to be Excesses; which this Writer, in what he calls his *Sermon*, does not; but in a confus'd Huddle of Stuff abuses the Dr. as running down *Christian Perfection*, only because he condemns Excesses in Religion; which yet he himself condemns, or pretends to condemn, likewise. *The happy Medium* (says he) in which it has pleased the Mercy of God to establish you — Meaning the Methodists, How a happy *Medium*; when they run into all these wild Extravagances? This is a gross Falsehood in Fact: I appeal to the World. Speaking of not setting his *Name* to his precious Piece, he appears mightily apprehensive of Temptations to *Pride*; and that whether his Piece be approv'd of by the World, or no: *I do not find myself sufficiently stock'd with Humility*, says he. Now I thought a *Saint* had been sufficiently stock'd with that Virtue: I (who am none) should, in doing my Duty, be neither elated with *Praise*, nor dejected with *Censure*. We come now to his *Sermon*, as he calls it.

P. I. "If we give any Credit to the express Word of God; we cannot be too good, we cannot be righteous overmuch." Not *too good*, strictly speaking, if he pleases; tho', by the Way, the

*Word*

*Word of God* says no such thing *expressly*; nor was there any occasion for it; however Reason, and common Sense does: But *Righteous over-much*, improperly so called. He takes no notice of the Dr's very plain, and clear State of this Matter; which, if he has any Understanding, and attended to what he read, (as an *Answerer* at least ought to do) is shameful Prevarication, and Calumny. The Texts he alledges to prove *Religious Perfection*, might well have been spared. Who denys Religious Perfection (Dr. T. I am sure does not) so far as our imperfect State is capable of it; or, in other Words, coming as near to it as possible? What we insist upon is, that Excess in Religion is not the Perfection of it, but contrary to it. In the next Lines, he has the same Blunder, or wilful Mistake; confounding *too good*, or *righteous over-much*, or *righteous in Excess* improperly, with *too good*, &c. properly speaking; tho' the Dr. had so clearly distinguish'd them.

P. 2. We have these Words. "But if "what this hasty, this deluded Man ad-  
"vances had been true, &c." For the  
*Hasty*, and *Deluded*, and very many more,  
Abuses, and Scurrilities, contrary not only  
to the Spirit of the Gospel, but to common  
Decency, and good Manners, (such Rudeness,  
and ill Breeding, as a civilized Quaker  
would be ashame of) as also his un-  
parallel'd

parallel'd Medley of *Railing*, and *Praying*; I refer to the Letter in the *Miscellany* before mentioned: We are now upon *Argumentation*. “ Could there be any occasion “ however of warning against it in *these Times*; when the Danger (as he himself “ to his Confusion owns) is on the contrary “ Extreme; when all manner of Vice and “ Wickedness abounds to a degree almost “ unheard of?” How to his *Confusion*? When he has shewn the Danger of *both Extremes*; and particularly that *over-much Righteousness* encourages *Profaneness*, and *Debauchery, Infidelity, and Atheism*? All the World knows, they play into each others Hands; and do the Devil's Busines between them. Thus much (and 'tis sufficient) in Answer to that doughty Objection; which by this Writer, and the other Pamphleteers against Dr. T. is very often repeated. “ I answer for the Present (says our “ Author) that *there must be Heresies among you*; that *they who are approved may be made manifest*.” He that can make any Sense of this Application of St. Paul's Words (except, no doubt, their clearly proving Dr. T. to be a Heretick) is more sagacious than I am; and so I leave it.

P. 4. and again p. 23. “ The Dr. was “ grossly (Lord grant he was not *maliciously*) “ mistaken in his explanatory Sermon on “ this Text, as well as in the Application “ of

" of it." To be *maliciously mistaken* is a little odd ; But let that pass. Here is an *Insinuation*, to put it at the lowest, that Dr. Trapp **MALICIOUSLY PERVERTED THE WORD OF GOD.** A Crime surely of a deep Dye : It approaches, I think, very nearly to the *Sin against the Holy Ghost* ; if it be not quite so. One would imagine, after this, it should be *proved* that the Dr. is at least *mistaken* ; whether *maliciously*, or no. Does this Man so much as pretend to prove it ? Not the least Glimpse of an Argument ; only his *Ipse dixit*, that his own Interpretation is right, and the Dr's wrong. " This is the true genuine Sense of the *Letter* ; and every other Sense put upon " it is *false*, and *groundless* ; and *wrested* " rather to *pervert*, than *explain*, the " Truth of the Text." Indeed ? The Sense of the *Letter*? Suppose this Sense to be *true* ; certainly it is not *literal* : A *Prosopopœia* was always thought to be a *Figure* : And whatever is *figurative* is not *literal*. Suppose again his Exposition to be a *good* one ; yet must it be the *only one* ? Can there be no *other* ? The Dr. himself mention'd the Exposition by way of *Prosopopœia* (of which our Author, with his usual Sincerity, takes no notice) not wholly disapproving it ; only preferring the other before it : And he has the Stream of learned Commentators on his side. That, I am

I am sensible, will weigh nothing with this, and such like Writer ; who value *no Authority*, but *their own*; by which alone they *dictate* to all others ; even to those who are by many degrees their *Betters* : without the least Appearance of Proof, or Argument. But suppose there were *no Authority* on our side ; does not our own *common Sense* tell us that *Solomon* speaks in his *own Person* ; unless good Reason can be given for the contrary ? In some Places he does, and must speak by way of *Proso-pœdia*, or in the Person of another ; because the *Sense manifestly* requires it. But is it so here ? Cannot *Solomon*, in his *own Person*, be suppos'd to condemn *Excesses* in Religion, and Morality ? Or whether he does, or no ; *is it not true*, that those *Excesses* are vicious and mischievous ? which is the Point Dr. T. insists upon. What our Author says about the *Connexion* of the Text with the Context, both before, and after, is most impertinent ; even admitting him to have prov'd his Point upon that Supposition : which yet he has not. It is well known . that *Solomon's Ecclesiastes* is an *unconnected Piece*, like his *Proverbs* ; tho' not so much.

In his Exposition of the 3 Verses p. 4, 5, 6. there are almost as many Falsehoods, and Absurdities, as there are Sentences ; which I could easily shew : But I have some-

something else to do with my Time, and Pains, than merely to expose him. Whether His Exposition be good, or not; he says nothing to overthrow Dr. Trapp's; nor even to prove his own: unless it is very plain, &c. may pass for Proof.

This again is such another *Proof.* p. 7.  
 " Is not the Meaning of this Text [as he  
 " interprets it] plain to the weakest Ca-  
 " pacity?" O! nothing plainer. Every  
 Cookmaid, and Journeyman-Shoemaker,  
 every Auditor in *Moor Fields*, or upon  
*Kennington Common*, must perceive, at  
 first Sight, that *Solomon*, when he says *be*  
*not righteous over-much*, speaks by way  
 of *Prosopopœia*, not in his own Person, but  
 in the Person, of a *vain Worldling*: 'This,  
 being not the *literal*, but the *figurative*,  
 must needs be the *first*, and *most obvious*  
 Sense; " plain to the weakest Capacity."

The next is such another *Proof.* " I have  
 " here given it to you, my beloved Bre-  
 " thren in Christ, such as I have it *from the*  
*" Mouth of the Royal Preacher himself."*  
*Solomon*, it seems, with his own Mouth,  
 told our Author, that he spake those words  
 not as with *his own Mouth*, but as with the  
*Mouth of another*. These *Methodists* have  
 wonderful Privileges. Dr. T. and I pre-  
 tend not to the Honour of any such oral  
 Conversations. In his *Address* p. vii. he  
 goes further; and says he delivers his  
 " saving Truths *from the Mouth of God*

"himself." That is, his own Frenzys, and false Interpretations of Scripture, were communicated to him by the immediate Voice of God. What Christian can bear This *Blasphemy*?

Under his 2d Head he proposes to *shew*, i. e. (according to his way of *Shewing*) to say, or *affirm* by his own mere Authority, without the least *Show of Proof* "the Character of the Persons suppos'd speaking here in the Text." This, he says, "is the same with the Character of Those whom *Solomon* here personates." Doubtless it is so; if he personates any Body at all. How should it be otherwise? "Who, "as we have made it appear already, in the first part of this Discourse, are a vain Set of Men, &c." Pretending, as he does, under his 1st Head to make it appear that *Solomon* personates such and such men, and giving us an account of Them, and their Principles, and Practises, he must certainly of course give us their *Character*: For how is That, but in Sound, distinct from the Other? And therefore I cannot imagine how This came to be made a distinct Head from the Former. But, it should seem, there is some Difference between being a *Methodist*, and being *Methodical*. "'Tis neither the Righteousness of the one (says he under his 1st Head, p. 5, 6.) "nor the Wickedness of the other, "that

" that offends him ; but the superlative  
 " Degrees of Both : Which tending equal-  
 " ly to shorten Life, he looks upon them  
 " as equally opposite to the Self-Love he  
 " fondles within him. And therefore he  
 " deems an *Excess of Debauchery* as great  
 " an Enemy to the lasting Enjoyment of  
 " the Pleasures of Life, as an *extraordi-*  
 " *nary Righteousness* would be." Now 'tis  
 the whole Business of what he calls his  
 2d Head to represent Dr. Trapp, all the  
 Clergy, and all Christians, except *absolute*  
*Profligates* on the one hand, and *Methodis*  
 on the other, under That very Char-  
 acter ; " a vain Set of Men, neither *Righ-*  
 " *teous enough* to have an habitual Desire  
 " of improving Vertue to its Perfection,  
 " nor quite so flagitious as to give into  
 " Self-destroying Vices" &c. In short, he  
 employs 9 Pages to abuse Dr. T. and such  
 as He is (*Him especially*, against whom his  
*Malice is perfectly diabolical*) as *refin'd Li-*  
*bertines*, p. 11. *Worldlings*, p. 13. *refin'd*  
*Debauchees*, p. 15, &c. Who are for mix-  
 ing just so much *seeming Vertue* with their  
*real Vices*, as shall hinder those Vices from  
 drawing them into temporal Inconveniences.  
 In plainer English Thus. They, (that is  
 Dr. T. and the rest, as above, but *He espe-*  
*cially*,) are a parcel of gluttonous, drunken,  
 whoring *Libertines* ; yet wary *Voluptu-*  
*arys*, having the *Prudence of the World*,

*the Flesh, and the Devil*, p. 11. indulging themselves in all manner of sensual Wick-edness, without the least Check, or Re-straint from any Sense of Duty, or the least Fear of God before their Eyes: Only *these Sons of Darkness are so far wise in their Generation*, p. 11. that they take great care of their ungodly Carcasses; take care to prolong their lives; do not carry their Gourmandizing, Drunkenness, Fornication, and Adultery, so far, as to bring upon themselves Fevers, Dropseys, Gouts, Consump-tions, soul Diseases, and so forth. " Alms-  
" giving and Avarice, Pride, and Humi-  
" lity, Temperance, and Luxury, while  
" as mutual Curbs to each other, they  
" combine to stem the Tide of Impediments  
" to worldly Enjoyment, which might flow  
" from *extraordinary Degrees* on either  
" Side, are [by Them] dextrously blended  
" together." In short, they are for just so  
much Vertue, and no more (i. e. none at  
all) as will serve to lengthen their Lives,  
and give a higher Gust, and Relish to their  
Vices; a *Zest* (as he expresses himself, p. 15.)  
*to Luxury, and worldly Pleasures.* This,  
without any Misrepresentation (only some  
of it in plainer, and more explicit Words)  
is our *Christian-Perfection* Man's Account  
of Dr. T. and all Others who think and  
live as He does. The rest indeed are  
pass'd over in the Lump: But *He* is  
over

over and over mention'd by Name. As He is a *Clergyman*, as He is a *Christian*, (in *Profession* at least) nay as He is a *Man*, He surely ought not to be thus accused by Name, without some *Proof*. Is here any? Not the least Shadow of it, so much as pretended to. He was never yet charg'd with *false Doctrine*; unless by Papists, Hereticks, or Infidels; and now by these Methodists. Nor did I ever hear of the least Blemish upon his *Moral Character*. Perhaps something more might be truly said in his favour with regard to *Both*; but I forbear. Behold the *Justice*, *Charity*, and *Christian Temper* of these *Modern Saints*. But, it may be, our Adversary will say the Dr. deserves This Character; because he is against the *Perfection of Righteousness*: How so? Why, because "with Him the *Perfection of Righteousness*, however he may play with Terms, "is the same as being *Righteous over-much*." How so again? What *Proof*? None in the World; only you have This Man's Word for it. We, on the other side, have full Proof of the Contrary. The Doctor in several Passages of his Sermons, especially in the 3 last Pages throughout, carefully guards against the Extreme in Defect; nay insists upon the very strictest *Precepts* of the Gospel: Tho' of This our Pamphleteer, with the utmost Baseness, and most

most wicked Prevarication, takes no manner of Notice. But in the Sequel, you will have more particular Instances of the Calumnys in This infamous defamatory Libel.

P. 13. “The *Worldly-minded Man* (meaning Dr. T.) who labours to deceive you, gains credit enough with you to establish that Maxim, that all superlative Degrees of *Almsgiving* are great Sins.” Dr. T. p. 68. warns against narrow Charities; and says those who are able ought to give largely, and liberally. Nor does he anywhere censure superlative Degrees of *Almsgiving*; tho’ what those Degrees are, is hard to determine. He is for as much real Virtue as possible; and the more the better: Only he insists that Virtue by real Excess degenerates into Vice. “And that a Man must never sell all he has, and give it to the Poor, according to Christ’s Advice.” 1st, Dr. T. does not say he never must; but that all are not obliged to it: Nor is it according to Christ’s Advice that they should: As he shews in his Sermon. 2dly, How does it appear that (as Things now stand at least) any one Person is so obliged? If he gives all to the Poor; how shall he live himself? Not to mention (as I have not Time) other Absurdities of This strange Doctrine; grounded upon a misunderstood Text of Scripture, and contrary

trary to common Reason. "Because some  
 " have Families of their own; and ought  
 " to make sufficient Provision for them,  
 " according to that selfish Proverb *Charity*  
 " begins at home; when no one, at least  
 " scarce any one, is wise enough to know,  
 " when he has a SUFFICIENCY." What  
 would the Man have here? Ought we not  
 to provide for our Families in the first  
 place? Is not the Proverb *Charity begins*  
*at home* very true? Why is it *selfish*?  
 That it may be, and sometimes is, *misap-*  
*ply'd*, Dr. T. himself observed. In this  
 Passage the Words SUFFICIENT, and SU-  
 FICIENCY, are printed in CAPITALS; as  
 if Dr. T. had been very *absurd*, or very  
*fallacious*, in not defining what is a SU-  
 FICIENCY. He confesses he cannot do it  
 in general Terms: That must be deter-  
 mined by Christian Prudence, and Discre-  
 tion, according to the Station, Quality,  
 and other Circumstances of the Persons  
 concerned. But he has in his Sermon, p. 68.  
 very particularly warned Those who, under  
 pretence of providing for their Families, are  
 shamefully covetous; and are observed to be  
 so by every body but themselves. *A dan-*  
*gerous Delusion This*; (adds he) *and very*  
*often, I fear, a fatal one.*

P. 14. "But then a superlative Degree  
 " of Humility, that is a Humility free  
 " from the least Tincture of Pride, or  
 " Vanity,

" *Vanity*, which is the same with them as  
 " *an over-strain'd Humility*, is a Fault, as  
 " well as a Folly." How is this prov'd  
 again? Prov'd, I mean, that Dr. T. asserts  
 it? Does he say any thing like it? He is  
 as much averse from the least Tincture of  
*Pride*, or *Vanity*, as any one can be; much  
 more than this Writer, whose unexampled  
*Pride* glares in the strongest Light through  
 his whole Pamphlet. But is there, or can  
 there be, no such thing as *over-doing* in  
 point of *Humility*? Did he never see a  
 Man treat his *Inferiors*, as if they were  
 his  *Bettters*? I am sure I have: And this I  
 think is *over-strain'd Humility*; a *Folly*,  
 and therefore not a *Vertue*. A little after,  
 in the same Page, he again quotes the Dr's  
 Words in *Capitals*; as if some gross Absur-  
 dity, or Wickedness, were to turn out. The  
 Dr. (as any rational Creature might see)  
 was there blaming those who indiscrimi-  
 nately condemn our having to do with ANY  
*Vanities*; without considering whether they  
 are vicious, or not; as some certainly are  
 not; every thing in the World, or the  
 World itself, being vain in one Sense: Con-  
 sequently, if we must not have to do with  
 ANY *Vanitys*; we must needs go out of the  
 World. And where is the mighty Harm  
 of all this?

*Ibid.* But now prepare for a *Master-piece*,  
 a *Curiosity* indeed; such an Instance of  
*Lying*,

Lying, and Defamation, as in my Life I never met with. Dr. Trapp, p. 18, 19. has these Words. " If no Books are to be read, but sacred, and divine ones, if no Heathen Authors particularly are to be perus'd by Christians; how happens it that St. Paul was learned in the Wisdom of the Greeks, and Romans, several times quotes the Writings of the Greek Poets, and incorporates them into the Body of his own?" To this what says our Methodist? " 'Tis nothing therefore surprizing, my Brethren in Christ, to see a Man of this Cast of Mind making a vain Ostentation of his little superficial Acquaintance with the ancient Greeks, and Romans. What is this but acting conformably to his Principle, that all Christians must have to do with some Vanities? And shall we wonder to hear such a one prefer their Writings to those of an Apostle?" The Vanities have been consider'd already. As to the rest; the Dr. for those very innocent Words just now cited, is accused, first, of Vanity, and Ostentation of Learning. Why? Is there one word sounding that way? Is it an Ostentation of Learning (especially in a Man who has so long made Learning his Study and Profession) to say that St. Paul quotes the Greek Poets? Secondly, together with Ostentation of Learning, he is charg'd

with Want of that very Learning he is here suppos'd to pretend to:--His little superficial Acquaintance with the ancient Greeks, and Romans. Be it as little and superficial as this Writer pleases; the Dr. makes no Show of any; farther than referring to St. Paul's Quotations aforesaid. Besides, how does this Man know it is little, and superficial? Possibly it may not be so. Dr. Trapp, it is well known to the World, has for about these forty Years, taken some Pains in the Writings of the ancient Greeks, and Romans, and other Parts of Learning, those especially which more immediately relate to his holy Function. If he has succeeded ill, if his Acquaintance with them be little, and superficial; it is purely for want of natural Talents, and Abilities, which it pleased God not to give him: And why should our Author reproach him upon that Account? What childish impotent Spight is this? Thirdly, He is accused of preferring the Writings of the Heathen Poets to the Writings of St. Paul. That is to say, he is accused of the most horrid Blasphemy that can well be imagined; but is there one word of Truth in this? Is the Dr's saying that St. Paul quotes Epimenes, Aratus, and Menander, the same as saying that he prefers their Writings to those of St. Paul? These are our modern Saints; these are our Methodists.

Ibid.

*Ibid.* What follows in the next Words is much of the same Stamp. “ Or be asto-  
“ nish’d to see him wound the Apostle  
“ with Railery, thro’ your sides, for wish-  
“ ing to know nothing but JESUS CHRIST,  
“ and him crucify’d ?” Dr. T. there speaks only of Those who take these Words of the Apostle in so strict, and literal a Sense, as to renounce, and condemn all *human Learning*; Which St. Paul never did: For he had a great deal of it himself; and made use of it, even after he was divinely inspired. So he could not be wounded through the Sides of the *Methodists*, *Quakers*, or any other *Enthusiasts*.

P. 15. “ Hence will every refin’d De-  
“ bauchee exclaim against it, with Dr.  
“ *Trapp*; *Be not over-much wicked, &c.*” Dr. T. lays no such thing: He never once touches upon those Words *Be not over-much wicked*. “ Little Sobriety, say they, is  
“ requisite to give a Zest to Luxury.” Dr. T. chiefly (for of him he chiefly speaks) is affirm’d to say this. *Where* does he say so, or any thing like it? “ But too much  
“ of it is too much.” — Dr. T. never in his life made such a ridiculous identical Proposition. “ To eat nothing but Bread, and  
“ Herbs, and drink nothing but Water,  
“ unless there be a particular Reason for it,  
“ (*such perhaps as Dr. Cheyne may assign,*” mighty smart that) “ is Folly at best (*that*  
D 2 “ is,

" is, even tho' it be done for Christ's Sake)  
 " therefore no Vertue." Dr. T. (even as  
 this Man quotes him) said unless there be a  
 particular Reason for it. Is for Christ's  
 Sake no particular Reason? This THAT is  
 is put in by our Author, and charged upon  
 Dr. T. But these notorious Falsehoods, and  
 Slanders proceed from *Saintship*; and so all  
 is well.

P. 16. " And if you should answer  
 " these carnally-minded Men with the  
 " Words of the Apostle, Rom. viii. *We*  
 " *are Debtors not to the Flesh to live after*  
 " *the Flesh, &c.* they will tell you, this is  
 " *teaching for Doctrines the Commandments*  
 " *of Men.*" That is, Dr. T. had said that  
 for these People by their own Authority to  
 impose things upon others as necessary,  
 which God never made so, is *teaching for*  
*Doctrines the Commandments of Men*:  
 THEREFORE he will say the same, if a *Text*  
*of Scripture* be urged to prove a *Doctrine*;  
 and that too a *Doctrine* which he himself  
 heartily embraces. He denys the Authority  
 of the *Methodists*; THEREFORE he de-  
 nys the Authority of St. *Paul*. " It will  
 " be to as little purpose to answer them  
 " with what the same St. *Paul* says else-  
 " where, Rom. xiv. 17. *The Kingdom of*  
 " *God is not Meat and Drink, &c.*" It  
 will indeed be to little Purpose so to answer  
 them, supposing they maintain'd the false.  
 Doctrines,

Doctrines, which our Author falsely puts upon them; because the Text he alledges is nothing at all to the Purpose: The Apostle is there speaking not of *Temperance*, and *Intemperance* in *Eating*, and *Drinking*: But of the *Mosaic ceremonial Distinction of Meats*, &c. “They will not blush to tell you that our blessed Saviour came eating and drinking.” Why did he not? Does not he himself say so? Why should any Man *blush* to cite his Words? Unless he *PERVERTED* them, or *falsely interpreted them*; as this Writer does almost every Text he meddles with.—“Nay work’d a Miracle to make Wine (at an Entertainment) when ’tis plain there had been more drank than was necessary.” Dr. T. goes on; tho’ our Author leaves out those Words—for the *Support of Nature*, &c. well, and is it not true? What would the Man have? What does he say against it? Truly this: “To such Lengths does the Love of the World hurry these self-fond, merry-making Worldlings?” What Lengths? Quoting a plain Historical Passage of Scripture, that’s all. *Another* indeed of the Pamphleteers against Dr. T. goes farther upon this Passage: And what he says shall not fail to be consider’d in due Time, and Place. The Writer under our present Consideration proceeds thus. “Tell them not of *self-denyal*; they will not hear

“ bear you.” Dr. T. in this very Discourse has preach’d *Self-denyal*; tho’ this Writer (according to his Custom) fraudulently dissembles it: In others he has largely, and particularly insisted upon it. “ JESUS, you will say, tells us *he that loveth his Life shall lose it*, &c. but these, and the like, “ they will inform you, are *Hyperbolical Phrases*.” They will inform you of no such thing; and never did. “ Now what signifies minding JESUS; when he speaks *Hyperbolically*, that is *more than is strictly true?*” Dr. T. had said (and ’tis true) that those Expressions of our Saviour’s, *turning one Cheek when the other is smitten*, &c. are *Proverbial* and *Hyperbolical*: THEREFORF he must needs say the same of every Text, by the Misapplication of which this Writer has a Mind to calumniate him.

—*Strictly true.*—Here is a *Quibble*; proceeding either from *Ignorance*, or *Prevarication*. Our Saviour and his Apostles, questionless, say nothing but what is *strictly true*, as to the *Sense*, and *Substance*; but they may, and often do, say what is *not strictly true* in the *bare Letter*, and *Expression*. Are there not innumerable *Metaphors*, and other *Tropical*, and *Figurative Phrases*, both in the Old, and New Testament? Did any Man in his Senses ever deny it? For *Hyperbole*’s particularly; Is it *literally true*, that if our Saviour’s Miracles had

had been all Recorded ; the *World itself*  
*would not contain the Books that should*  
*have been written ? Is it literally true that*  
*it is easier for a Camel to go through the*  
*Eye of a Needle, than for a rich Man to*  
*enter into the Kingdom of God ? Since we*  
*are upon *Hyperbole's* ; I naturally observe,*  
*that it would be no great one to say that in*  
*this single Paragraph of our pretended*  
*Saintly Censor, and Reformer, from the*  
*middle of Page 15 to the middle of Page 17*  
*there are as many false Quotations, flat*  
*Lies, and malicious Slanders, as almost e-*  
*qual the Number of Lines : And that there*  
*are ten times more than these in the other*  
*Parts of his very short Pamphlet. There*  
*is really scarce one Word of truth, nay *not**  
*one Word of material Truth (i. e. such as*  
*opposes his Adversary) in any thing he*  
*says.*

P. 17. " But You are charged, Oh  
 " Beloved Lovers of perfect Righteousness,  
 " with Extravagances. You allow of  
 " no sort of Recreation, or Diversion ; no-  
 " thing but an universal Mortification, and  
 " Self-denial." Why must every thing in  
 the Dr's Discourse be apply'd to these  
*Methodists* ? Were there never any but  
 They, who taught *false Doctrine* upon  
 This Subject ? Dr. T. has very often, long  
 since, upon various Occasions taken no-  
 tice of it in his Sermons : And so, no doubt,  
*have*

have many others; Nay we certainly know they have. These Passages themselves, which our Author here refers to, were written, and preach'd at least ten Years, before the *Methodists* were heard of. Their Appearance, 'tis true, has made it more necessary than it was Before, to oppose these frantick Notions: But all the World knows there have been many Books extant long agoe, (some of them good ones in the main) in which these *uncommanded Extraordinaries* are inculcated to the great Prejudice of Religion. Indeed for Clergymen of the Church of England to *preach in the Fields*, to *hate*, and *malitiously traduce* the *Church*, and *Clergy*, &c. is totally new, all over *Methodistical*. But those are Matters of a distinct Consideration. "NO PLEASURE, BUT FROM RELIGION ONLY." Words quoted from the Dr. and printed in CAPITALS again! This redoubted Argument occurs very often; without any other to support it. Notwithstanding which, the Dr. still insists that it is *false Doctrine* to teach that we must have no Pleasure, but from Religion only: And let this Writer prove the contrary, if he is able. "GRIEF MUST BE CURED ONLY BY PRAYER:" Still quoting the Dr's Words, and answering them by the *Shape of Letters*, the Argument aforesaid. "A horrid Grievance This to such

" as

" as think Prayer burthensome at best." Why must Prayer needs be a *Burthen* to Those, who labouring under *Melancholy*, *Misfortunes*, and *human Infirmitiy*, seek for Relief, in some Degree, from something else *besides* Prayer, as from the Conversation of Friends, and other innocent Diversions? *Prayer* indeed is the *chief* and *best* Remedy; but it is not the only one. St. James says, *Is any Man afflicted? let him pray:* But he does not say, *Let him do nothing else.* There can scarce be a greater Scandal thrown upon the Christian Religion by the Devil himself; than to say that we cannot be *Christians*, without ceasing to be *Men*.

P. 18. " What you look upon as adviseable only, these Perverters of Truth insinuate to be look'd upon by you as indispensable Dutys." Some have taught that these uncommanded Austeritys are indispensable Dutys. But admitting that they are recommended as advisable only; Dr. T. thinks otherwise; and so, I believe, do all sober, judicious Divines, and Christians, whether Laic, or Ecclesiastic. And what has this Writer proved to the Contrary? " And lest Prevarication should fail; downright Falshoods must be placed to your Account; so that *to taste an agreeable Fruit, or smell to a Rose,* must be unlawful with you, however

E                          " you

" you disown it." Here again Dr. T. says nothing about the *Methodists* in particular. If they disown it; so much the better. Nor does he assert any *Falshood* by saying, So THAT to taste &c. He does not charge *any Body* with teaching that Doctrine in *so many Words*; What he says only imports that it will follow from the Assertion of Those, who condemn *all Pleasure* but that of Religion. So THAT (according to them, Words plainly imply'd, tho' not express'd) to taste, &c. or smell, &c. must be unlawful.

What he says about the *Beast with seven Heads coming out of the Sea*, and *Solomon's seven Abominations in the Heart*, is perfect *Quakerism*, Enthusiastic Madness, and Malice; and so I leave it.

Now for his third, and last Head. "The Persons, he says, to whom *Solomon* in the Character of a *Worldling* addresses himself," cannot be the *Wicked*; nor the *Righteous in the common Way*; but "such ONLY as persisting stedfastly in a firm Adherence to all the essential Laws of God, content not themselves with the practise of common Virtues, in a common Degree, but live in a perpetual Habitude of Desires, Struggles and Yearnings towards an intimate Union with *Christ*, in the Perfection of Righteousness :" P. 19, 20. To pass over that

that odd Expression *essential Laws*; and the Singularity of a Person, in *Solomon's* time, desiring an intimate Union with *Christ*: This is indeed an excellent Character; such a one as every Christian ought to deserve; and Others may deserve it, besides Methodists; and much better too. But I say (and I prove it, as well at least as He proves the Contrary) that *Solomon*, not in the Character of a *Worldling*, but in his own *Person*, may apply himself 1st, To very wicked men, i. e. *Hypocrites*; who pretend to extraordinary Righteousness, tho' in reality they have none at all. Or rather 2dly, To truly religious, and well-designing, but weak, and injudicious Persons, who take the Excesses of Virtue to be virtuous; when in Truth they are vicious. "They are not  
 "of the Number (continues He) "of  
 "Those Righteous with Indifference, who  
 "would fain blend the Service of God, and  
 "Mammon, &c." Neither Dr. T. nor  
 any of his Cast (as This Writer elsewhere  
 speaks) ever said any thing in favour of  
 such a Character; but totally detest, and  
 abhor it. P. 21. "What Wonder then,  
 "Christians, to You I speak oh! true  
 "Christians — what Wonder is it that You  
 "should be charged with *Enthusiasm*, with  
 "Folly, with *Fanaticism*, and *Madness*?  
 "Were not the *Apostles* so before you,

" when they preach'd JESUS *Christ?*" This is always the profane, and blasphemous Talk of Enthusiasts; making their own Case parallel with that of the Apostles; and very often of our Saviour Himself. Whereas the Difference is plainly This; *They* were accused *falsely*; *These* are accused *truly*: We prove what we say of our Enthusiasts; But the unbelieving *Jews* and *Heathens* could not prove what They said of *Christ*, and his Apostles. P. 22. " Oh! my Heart within me is " broken, because of the *Clergy*." The *Clergy in general*, You see: Here You have the true Spirit of *Methodism*: And so he goes on; profanely applying the Words of *Jeremiah* to Himself; and closes the Paragraph with Dr. T. in particular: " *This deluded Clergyman.*" Ibid. " When " the *Clergy* —— become Teachers of " worldly Maxims —— " How so again? What *Proof*? " It is notorious that for " the moralizing *Iniquity* of the *Priests* " the Land mourns." This, I think, is some of *Whitfield's* nonsensical and malicious Jargon. *Moralizing Iniquity!* Are the *Clergy* chargeable with *Iniquity* for preaching up *Morality*? If they did *nothing else* indeed; if they neglected the *Mystery of Godliness*, Christianity *as such*, Christian Morality *as such*, (which they do not;) They would then be justly chargeable.

able. *Ibid.*, and p. 23. "Such is the Language, my beloved Lovers of *Christian Perfection*, which the indolent, earthly-minded, Pleasure-taking Clergy of the Church of *England* use, to strengthen the hands of Evil-doers; that none may return from his Wickedness." Such Language? What Language? How and where is it to be found? What can one say more to this notorious Slanderer, and Liar; who says just what he pleases to abuse the Clergy with all the Malice of Hell; without alledging the least Appearance of one single *Proof*? Observe here, that the Clergy of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND are particularly mention'd; *They*, and *They only*; Not the least Reflection upon the Clergy of any other Sect of Christians; no not the *Papists*. Who is so blind as not to see that the Inveteracy of these Enthusiasts, and false Prophets (like that of the Infidels, and Atheists) is level'd against the ESTABLISH'D CHURCH, and CLERGY of ENGLAND? P. 23. "Letter-learned Divine." Whitfield's Cant, and Nonsense, again. "Who has dip'd his Pen in Gall." This is another gross Falshood in Fact. There is not a Drop of *Gall* in the Dr's Sermons. There is *Salt*, if he pleases: There is Sharpness and Severity; and so there ought to be,

P. 24. " Lord, reward him, according  
" to his *Works*." St. Paul indeed says  
those very Words of Alexander the Cop-  
persmith: As it is in our English Transla-  
tion: For in very good MS S. of the Ori-  
ginal, it is SHALL reward him. Or, according  
to this other Reading; in so great an Apostle  
it might be a judiciary Sentence: and is by  
Some so interpreted. But in a Person  
uninspir'd, as This Writer (whatever he  
may think of himself) certainly is, I know  
not what to call it, but the most solemn,  
*profane, unchristian Curse*, I ever read, or  
heard of. This Writer all along supposes  
the Dr's *Works* to be extremely wicked:  
And he prays God, in Scripture-Phrase,  
to reward him according to Those Works,  
that is, to *damn* him. " And suffer him  
" no longer to be HASTY IN HIS WORDS;  
" that we may have Reafon to entertain  
" better HOPES OF HIM for the Future."  
Dr. T. has no *hasty Words* in his Sermons;  
has preach'd nothing but well-weigh'd,  
true, and sound Doctrine. But how can  
this Man entertain *better hopes* of him for  
the future; when he has (as far as in him  
lay) *sent him to Hell already*? The Writ-  
ter of the Letter in the Miscellany has  
remark'd upon our Author's Medley of  
*Praying, and Railing*: By all means  
let That of *Praying, and Cursing* be ad-  
ded to the other.

The

The next is such *Pride* and *Insolence* as is truly new. P. 25. " Full well I know  
 " that this Sermon will not be pleasing to  
 " my poor peevish *Adversary*: For *Cor-*  
*rection* is not to Pleasure, but to Profit.  
 " Few *Children* can be brought willingly  
 " to *kiss the Rod* which rebuketh them;  
 " tho' when they become of *riper under-*  
*standing*, they will bleſſ the hand that  
 " guided it. Thus shall this *angry Man*,  
 " I trust, thank me one Day for reprov-  
 " ing him." Dr. T. is certainly not *a Child*  
 in *Age*; and perhaps not *quite a Child* in  
*Knowledge* and *Understanding*. He has  
 been a well known Divine, and Preacher,  
 for these 32 Years at least; he has been so  
 in the Metropolis of the Kingdom, more  
 than 30 Years. Methinks therefore it is  
 not very *becoming* in This Writer (*who-*  
*ever* he be) to *vilify* him with so much  
*Scorn*, and *Contempt*; at the same time  
*magnifying himself*, as if he were another  
*St. Paul.* By the Words following, one  
 would imagine he thought so indeed. P. 26.  
 " I wash my hands, and *am innocent of*  
 " *the Blood of all.*" So says the great  
 Apostle. Afterwards in the same Page:  
 " *Be ye Followers together of Me.*" So  
 says *St. Paul.* " And if any, even the  
 " Appearance of an Angel, should presume  
 " to teach you any other *GOSPEL*, than  
 " That WHICH I HAVE TAUGHT you; let  
 " him

*"him be accursed."* Very *Apostolical*, I must needs say: But before he had used such Words, methinks he should have proved himself to be an Apostle. He goes on in St. Paul's Language, 'till These Words in CAPITALS again, "to shew the great Importance of them; EVEN THE STUB-BORN HEART OF OUR PERVERSE ADVERSARY;" that is Dr. Trapp: Which God "of his infinite mercy grant, &c. Amen, Lord JESUS! Amen." Thus concluding all with his ungodly Jumble of *Railing*, and *Praying*, so often mention'd.

I should not have troubled the World with so many Words upon this very ridiculous, as well as wicked Pamphlet; but for the 3 following Reasons.

1st, Tho' what this Writer says against Dr. T. deserves no Notice upon it's own Account; (and the same is true of his other five Answerers) yet as the *Cause* is of the utmost Importance, I was not willing that the *Common People* should be deluded by being told that those *Answers* were not reply'd to; and so These crack-brain'd *Enthusiasts*, or profane *Hypocrites*, should triumph as if they were unanswered. Much Mischief has often been done by Those who at first appeared very contemptible: Witness the *Quakers*. And perhaps there is not a greater Instance of *Wise Men's Folly*, than their neglecting considerable *Evils* in the Beginning;

*Beginning*; only because they are introduced by *inconsiderable Persons*.

*2dly*, It was proper to take this Opportunity of more fully *explaining, enlarging, and improving* the Doctrines taught in the Sermons which have made these Enthusiasts so outrageous: Doctrines true, and of the greatest Importance; and necessary to be inculcated in *these Times* especially. Many a foolish *Answer* has been the Occasion of such Improvements.

*3dly*, It was proper to shew the World the *true Spirit of These Methodists*; which is no where better discern'd than in This, and the other Pamphlets against Dr. T. This especially. The most unchristian Malice, Lying, Slander, Railifg, and Cursing, are, it seems, the Criterion of modern Saintship. Let my Soul be among the Heathen Philosophers, rather than among these Saints. *The Accuser of the Brethren* is the Character of the *Devil* himself; nay his very *Name* is derived from *Accusing*. However, he accuses some very *truly*; though he at first tempted them into those Sins, of which he accuses them. But *These Methodists*, Those especially who are *Clergy-men themselves*, accuse *falsely*; accuse *falsely* their *Brethren* of the *Clergy*; whom 'tis plain, they mortally hate, and would, if it were in their Power, exterminate from

the Face of the Earth. Let any one of the least Discernment judge, whether the *Papists* and *Infidels* be not firm and faithful Allies to these Enthusiasts. And Oh! what a noble Exploit would the Establishment of Popery, or Infidelity be, to the Methodists in General, and to This Writer in particular. As to whom; I declare for my own Part, I would rather be *really* an *indolent, pleasure-taking Half-Christian*, nay any thing almost, but an Infidel, or Atheist, than such a one as *He* is. Nothing (except Infidelity, or Atheism) can be more contrary to the *Spirit of Christianity*, than *His Spirit*. I pray God (and so I am sure does Dr. T.) to give him a better Mind. And so much for *This Pamphlet*.

In the Examination of which, I have been large and particular; but shall not be so in the Examination of the rest. They are *all* written against the *same Discourse*: And the Rudeness, and Ill manners, the Pride, and Insolence, the Spight, and Malice, the Misrepresentations, and Misquotations, the Lying, and Slander, the false Doctrine, and false Reasoning, are *much the same* in *all* of them. I shall, however, omit nothing that has not been fully answer'd already.

The next Piece has the following Title.  
*Dr. TRAPP Try'd, and Cast; and allowed to the 10th of May next to Recant.* This again

again is *Methodistical Wit*. But how is the Dr. try'd? I expected he would have been set to the *Bar*; that the *Jury* would bring in their *Verdict*, and the *Judge* pronounce *Sentence*. But there is not a Word of a *Trial* in the whole Pamphlet. The Author of which is, if not a downright *Methodist*, yet a *rigid Calvinist* of the old Cut; mighty zealous for the Revival of Calvinism among us: Which Dr. T. has no more to do with, than any other Clergyman of the Church of *England*. And therefore all this Writer's Trash from p. 19 to the End shall be pass'd over by me; tho' nothing would be more easy than to expose both his *false Doctrine*, and his *false History*; together with the *raving Enthusiasm*, and *Blasphemy* of the false Prophets, whom he quotes and admires.

His Title Page has these two Motto's:  
*Thou spakest against thy Brother; thou flandereſt thy own Mother's Son.* Psal. L. 20.

*How empty's Learning, and how vain is Art!*

*But as it mends the Life, and guides the Heart.*

In his Preface, he takes it for granted that Mr. *Whitfield*, and the rest of that Fraternity contribute much to the *Betterment* (as he calls it) of the Nation; that

*preaching* is very laudable, and that **WHAT IS CALLED** the *Consecration* of a *Place* is an insignificant Circumstance: All which I leave to the Consideration of the Reader. Now for the Pamphlet itself.

P. 3. and again p. 12. "Him whom he calls *his Lord and Master*." Dr. T. certainly calls *Jesus Christ* his Lord, and Master. However, he has no such Words in the Discourse under Consideration: This therefore was most impertinent. "And here I MUST PREMISE, [This certainly must be something of great Moment]" "That my Expectations were highly raised upon their Publication, meaning the Dr's Sermons; and great Hopes I had that they would have turned out more for *Spiritual*, than for *worldly Profit*; and not that the *Booksellers* only should receive the greatest Advantage from them." Sure the Man *wrote This*, merely because he was resolved to *write something*: I can make nothing else of it. "However it be, a thinking Person would be apt to imagine, that by the Bulk of these *Four Discourses* the Dr. had not *study'd over-much*; nor, in the Management of them, been *over-much righteous*." Not to take notice of the *Nonsense* contain'd in these Words; I only answer with great Calmness, *very likely*. And the same I answer to many other Propositions, Remarks, and Reflections,

Reflections, of equal Weight. Such as These. That "there is more profound Divinity contain'd in one of Mr. Whitfield's Sermons than in the whole Substance of Dr. T.'s Four Discourses :" P. 3. That the said Mr. Whitfield is pious, knowing, laborious for the Salvation of Souls, &c. P. 10, 11, 15. When 'tis as easy for me to say, that He is both impious and ignorant ; and that his Labours tend not to the Salvation, but to the Damnation, of Souls. "That the Dr. did not act the Part of a Gentleman, nor a Christian, in not acquainting his Hearers, and Readers, what those things were, which this raw Novice (as he calls him) took upon him to teach his learned Brethren the Clergy ; that this is such an artful Collusion as is shocking, &c." P. 8. When the Notoriety of the Fact was such ; when all the World knew the Pride, Impudence, and Insolence of Whitfield in That Respect, particularly his charging the Clergy with preaching only the Shell of Religion. That "what St. Paul says of Timotheus is applicable to Mr. Whitfield ; P. 8, 9." That "the Spirit of Dr. T. such a long-standing Divine, is moved, to see, or hear, that Mr. Whitfield has so many more Followers, than himself." P. 9. That the said Followers of Mr. Whitfield "behave themselves as orderly and decently

" decently in an *open Field*, as in a *Church*;"  
 P. 10. Whereas I think these Field-Assembyls are *in themselves* indecent and disorderly, and something worse. " That a-  
 " greeably to the Rules of Civility, and the  
 " Obligations of the Gospel, Dr. T. should  
 " have advised Mr. W. in a *private Manner*." P. 11. When his *Actions* were pub-  
 lic, and he had *already* done so much *Mis-  
 chiefe* in the World. " That the Dr. was  
 " conscious to himself that he had nothing  
 " to bring against him in a direct Way ;  
 " and therefore took an indirect one, which  
 " he thought the surest to disparage him,  
 " and beguile his own weak Hearers.  
 " *ibid.* That he was artfully collusive in  
 " bringing in Mr. *Law*, as if he were one  
 " of Those whom he calls *modern Enthu-  
 siasists*, which is as far from Truth, as Truth  
 " from Lies." *ibid.* Whereas the Dr. had  
 quoted Mr. *Law* before he came to the Article of *Enthusiasm*: Not but that Mr. *Law*  
 is obnoxious enough to That Charge; Witness, besides his *Christian Perfection*, &c. That Enthusiaſtical Rhapsody of his lately publish'd, called, *The Grounds and Reasons of Christian Regeneration*; and his *Answer to Dr. TRAPP's Discourse*: Due Notice of which will be taken in due time. Thus for these *smaller Matters*: But the more important Passages (*how important even Those*

Those are, let the Reader judge) must by no means be so slightly pass'd over.

P. 4. Dr. T. had said that *to be righteous over-much is itself very often at least one Sort of Vice, and a bad Sort too.* He happens to have Witness that he said here was a little Mistake (he being at a Distance from the Press) in the Writing, or Printing; that small Carpers would object to This, and ask whether there be any *good Sort of Vice.* Accordingly, our Author says here is much Obscurity, or Nonsense. But after all, to say a *bad sort of a bad thing* is no more than to say a *very bad thing:* And nothing is more common in ordinary Discourse; — A *bad Sort of Fever*, and the like. “ But lest the “ Dr’s great Profundity (continues he) “ should not be taken Notice of; he re-“ peats it, saying *I say very often at least.*” Repetitions are frequently proper; but *This Repetition was necessary.* *I say very often, at least:* (adds the Dr.) because sometimes ‘tis rather FOLLY, than SIN. The next is so *very Witty*, and written in such Gaiety of Heart; that I must not conceal it from the Reader. “ This brings to my Mind “ what a dignify’d Drone said in his “ Discourse on these Words, *Take double “ Money in your Hands, and the Money “ that was brought in the Mouth of your “ Sacks.* Beloved (says he) I make this “ Discovery

" Discovery ; that large Sacks, and more  
 " Sacks hold more than little Sacks, and few  
 " Sacks." How this Stuff should be *brought*  
*to his Mind* by what the Dr. said, I cannot  
 imagine ; the one having no Kind of Simi-  
 litude with the other : But you see 'tis  
 extremely sharp and facetious ; and let our  
 Author by all Means enjoy it. " From  
 " whence 'tis plain that some Men who  
 " are distinguish'd by these two great Let-  
 " ters, D. D. are no wiser than some of  
 " their Neighbours." Very true. " Not-  
 " withstanding the Haughtiness of their  
 " Looks ; and that Air of Contempt  
 " with which they treat others." I an-  
 swer; Dr. T. has no Haughtiness in his  
 Looks, nor any Thing like it ; and treats  
 nothing with Contempt but what *deserves*  
 to be so treated: And nothing deserves it  
 more than *Pride*, and *Impudence*, join'd  
 with *Ignorance*.

Dr. T. said there is no such thing as being  
*righteous, good, or virtuous over-much, PRO-*  
*PERLY, STRICTLY, and LITERALLY speaking.*  
 This Man himself quotes him as saying so ;  
 then leaving out those last Words, upon which  
 all turns, he asks this Question : " If then  
 " there be no such thing as being *righteous,*  
 " *good, or virtuous over-much* ; to what  
 " Purpose does he make all this Harangue  
 " about that of which there is no such  
 " thing ?" Pray observe both the *Fairness*  
     *of*

*of the Question; and the Propriety of the Language.* After two or three Sentences more, by which 'tis impossible to guess what he means ; he closes the Paragraph Thus. " So that nothing from no-  
" thing; and there remains nothing." What Relation these Words have to Dr. T. or what is the Meaning of them, I know not : But I suppose they were intended for *Wit* again ; and let him make the most of them.

P. 6. " Wholly abstaining from Things  
" indifferent, (says the Dr.) and innocent  
" in themselves, as forbidden and unlawful,  
" is a signal Instance of being righteous over-  
" much; and so on the other hand, is mak-  
" ing Things indifferent to be necessary, and  
" Matters of Duty. Who (I should have said WHOM; because That is Grammar)  
" or what the Dr. here means is best known  
" to himself." I answer ; he plainly means no certain particular Persons, or Things ; but speaks indefinitely of Things *indifferent* on the one hand, *unlawful* on the other. What petulant Carping is This? " Yet  
" I hope he will allow there are some  
" Things that he may judge *indifferent*,  
" and *innocent* in themselves, yet others  
" may think them *forbidden*, and *unlaw-*  
" *ful*: If so, I see no Reason why ab-  
" staining from them can be a signal In-  
" stance of being *righteous over-much*."

If you see no Reason for it; I do. Their thinking This or That of a Thing does not alter the Nature of the Thing.—“ No ; “ on the contrary, I am fully persuaded “ that the *Imposing indifferent* things as “ *necessary*, and *deterring others* from the “ contrary as *unlawful*, is not only a signal, “ but a sad Instance of being *greatly*, and “ *grievously sinful.*” So says Dr. T. too ; provided the Imposing, and Deterring, be by *private Persons*; of which alone He is speaking. But 'tis quite otherwise; if Things in themselves indifferent are impos'd by *publick Authority*; For then they cease to be indifferent *as to us*: And of These 'tis plain This Writer speaks ; thus condemning all human Laws, whether Ecclesiastical, or Civil, which impose Things in *themselves indifferent*; that is, almost *all* human Laws *whatsoever*: Tho' I suppose his Reflexion was intended only upon the Rites, and Ceremonies of our Church.

*Ibid.* and P. 7. “ To place much Religion, where there is really none, (but the contrary) in *Extraordinaries*, in *new Inventions*, and striking out into *Bye-Paths*, is so far from being righteous over-much, that it may rather be term'd a being *wicked over-much*; especially if what is *contrary to Religion* is placed in the room of it.” Let him enjoy his Saying with all my Heart ; tho' I think

think he expresses himself very improperly. Dr. T. spoke more favourably of Extremes and Errors on that Side. " This I think " is *setting up Evil for Good.*" I think so too : and Dr. T. says, that to call any *Excess* by the Name of Virtue is to *call Evil Good.* " And consequently cannot " proceed from a good Design." This Consequence I deny. A Man may do an ill thing with a good Design.—" But " rather from a wicked and perverted " Judgment." A *wicked Judgment* is an improper Expression ; a *perverted* one, if you please. " But what things of this " Nature the Doctor means, he best knows, " and can best account for." The same senseless Impertinence as before : And so is the rest to the End of the Paragraph, which I will not be at the Trouble of transcribing.

P. 7, 8. " I now come to That which " seems to give the Doctor the greatest " Uneasiness." Meaning *Whitfield's Behaviour* ; concerning which he recites the Doctor's Words at large. It does indeed give him great Uneasiness ; and so it does to all good and sober Christians.

P. 9, 10, 11. Quoting, or rather Mis-quoting, these Words of the Doctor's—*so ridiculous, as to create the greatest Laughter ; were it not so deplorable, and detestable, as to create the greatest Grief,*

G 2 and

and Abhorrence ; he adds this cutting Stroke of Archness : “ Which is as much “ as to say, he could *split his Sides with* “ *laughing for Scorn one while ; was he* “ *not ready to tear his Flesh for Vexation* “ *at another.*” Which I leave with the Reader ; from whom I would by no means conceal the least Fragment of our Author’s delicate Wit and Railery. For his own, and Mr. Whitfield’s Doctrine of the New Birth, or Regeneration, which neither of them understands, I refer to Dr. Waterland’s incomparable Discourse, entitled *Regeneration stated and explain’d.* Dr. T. is no way affected by it. “ Nor did “ this young Divine ever maintain those “ Things the Doctor insinuates, but quite “ the Reverse.” What Things ? The Doctor charges nothing upon *Him* in particular, but his *Behaviour* ; which is publick and known to all the World.— “ As may be well remember’d by some “ Persons who heard him on the Subject “ of the *Wedding Feast.*” It may be so : But I am one of those who never heard him ; and never intend to hear him. What follows in the very next Words to the Bottom of P. 12. ought to be thoroughly dissected. “ But the Doctor has found out some- “ thing which, I believe, was never found “ out before, and that is, in speaking of “ the *Marriage Feast*, at which our Sa- “ viour

" viour was present, and wrought a Mi-  
 " racle, he says there had been more drank  
 " than was absolutely necessary for the  
 " Support of Nature. Here I would ask  
 " the Doctor how he came to the Know-  
 " ledge of this Secret ; since I am well as-  
 " sured he could not have it from the  
 " Scriptures." Now I think he could have  
 it from the Scriptures, from those very  
 plain Words, *John ii. 10. Every Man at*  
*the beginning doth set forth good Wine;*  
*and when Men have well drunk, then that*  
*which is worse : But thou hast kept the*  
*good Wine until now.* That is, until now,  
*when Men have well drunk :* Otherwise  
 there is no Opposition between the two  
 Parts of the Sentence ; and no Sense in the  
 whole Passage, " Besides, it is no great  
 " Proof of his Learning and Prudence, to  
 " throw so base a Reflexion on such a so-  
 " lemn occasional Festival, as that must  
 " have been, which was honour'd with the  
 " Company and Conversation of Him,  
 " whom he calls *his Lord and Master.*"  
 Dr. T. has thrown no Reflection ; but this  
 Man has thrown a base, and profane one  
 indeed ; by supposing that if the Affair  
 was, *as it really was*, it must be a Re-  
 flexion upon, and tend to the Dishonour of  
 our Saviour. " And what is a yet fur-  
 " ther Aggravation of his *Impiety*, and  
 " gives a great Handle to *Atheism*, is  
 " to

" to suppose that our Blessed Saviour  
 " would (to give the first Proof of his Di-  
 " vinity) miraculously turn Water into  
 " Wine for a Company which WAS NOT  
 " SOBER, or had DRANK TOO MUCH." Was there ever such a lying Slanderer, as well as so profane a Wretch ! To drink *more than is absolutely necessary for the Support of Nature*, (which are Dr. T's Words) is, it seems, exactly the same with *being not sober, or drinking too much.* " Well may *Atheism* and *Infidelity* spread, " if the Cause of Christianity had no better " a Defender than One who puts *so vile a Disparagement upon the first miraculous Work of its Author.*" If the *grossest and most malicious Calumnys* in these pretended *Saints* be likely to make *Atheists and Infidels*; well may *Atheism* and *Infidelity* spread indeed. " This Observation of his, I think, " carrys in it something so shocking to a " sincere Christian ; that it ought not to be " pass'd over without a severe Reproof from " his Ecclesiastical Superiors." Doubtless Dr. T. ought to be animadverted upon by his Superiors for this horrid Enormity ; that is, referring to a plain Fact of Scripture-History : but the false Doctrines and Blasphemys of the Methodists, their Field-Assemblies, and Conventicles in Houses, contrary to the Laws of God, and Man, of Church, and State, and tending to the Ruin of Both, ought

ought not to be taken Notice of by any Authority, whether Ecclesiastical, or Civil. That, forsooth, would be *Persecution*.

P. 13. Upon the Dr's saying that the *Righteous over-much* are not acquainted with the true Spirit and Genius of Christianity, he has This wise Remark. "This, " I think, is no great Compliment to the "Bishops, who ordain'd them; for what "Good then did the *Imposition of their "Hands* do them?" 1st, Dr. T. was not speaking of *Clergymen* only. 2dly; The *Imposition* of Hands in Ordination confers a Commission indeed; but was never pretended to confer Grace, Learning, Judgment, and Knowledge. *Ibid.* and P. 14. He is wonderfully diverting. The Dr. had made a *general* Reflexion upon the Weakness, and Folly of Mankind: *Alas!* *Generally speaking, a great Part of our Lives is spent, before we are wise enough to perceive that we are Fools.* This Man represents him as speaking of *himself in particular*, and owning himself to be a *Fool*: Then throws out a great deal of Scurrility, and awkward Jesting upon That Supposition. This I mention; and That is *Answer* sufficient.

P. 15. "The Dr. further says, *The Mischiefs done of late, and in so short a Time, by such Doctrines, and Teachers, are sufficiently known to the World. They have*

" have set the nearest and dearest Relations at variance, &c. By the same Rule of Reasoning he might object the Doctrines of our Lord as false: Did not he tell his Followers in plain Words, *I am come to set a Man at variance against his Father, &c.* Matth. x. 35.—This is a poor empty Way of Arguing, and very unbecoming a D. D." I answer, the Dr. does not urge these Facts as Arguments to prove the Methodistical Doctrines to be false; That he proves by other Arguments: He only refers to the Facts; shewing that the Doctrines are mischievous in their Consequences, as well as false in themselves. As to the Words of our Saviour in the Text alledg'd; relating not to the natural Tendency; but the accidental Effects of his Doctrine; any one of Discernment may easily perceive how little they are to This Writer's Purpose. Our Saviour's Doctrines are all true, and good in themselves; tho' by the Corruption of the World, they may be made the Subject of Variance and Discord.

P. 16. He calls Dr. T. a " Schismatick for departing from the Doctrine of Assurance; a Doctrine of the Church of England, &c." This, as the Dr. opposes it, with the other pernicious Calvinistical Tenets, is not the Doctrine of the Church

Church of *England*; and never was: but only of some particular Divines of the Church of *England*: as Bp. *Bull* in his Answer to Dr. *Tully*, and Dr. *Heylin* in his *Historia Quinquarticularis* have abundantly shewn. What he says p. 16, 17. about Archbishop *Laud*; our "subscribing *Calvinistic* Articles, and preaching up *Arminian* Doctrines; *John Edwards* of *Cambridge*, &c. is *utterly false*, as the Learned well know; Tho' whether true, or false, Dr. *T.* has no more to do with it, than any other Divine of the Church of *England*, as I said Before. The next is altogether admirable.

P. 18. "The Dr. who gives so much Caution against being *righteous overmuch*, does, no wonder, condemn the extraordinary Motions, and Impulses of the Spirit." It is no Wonder, it seems, that he who cautions against Excesses, and Frenzys in Religion, should condemn the Inspiration of the Prophets, and Apostles. For so He must do, who condemns the extraordinary Motions and Impulses of the Spirit. But how does Dr. *T.* condemn These? Why because he condemns the Pretensions of those Men who *confidently say* they have such Motions and Impulses, without proving it, or giving the least Shadow of a Reason for it. "Wherefore I would be glad to know by what Motions or

¶ Impulses he took on him the *Work* of  
 " the *Ministry*; whether it was by *or-*  
 " *ordinary* or *extraordinary* Motions; or  
 " Impulses." I answer; by *ordinary*.  
 " If by *ordinary* ones; they might be  
 " *worldly*—As a *Mitre*, or a *good Living*,  
 " and an *odd Benefice*, or two besides."  
 To pass over the Wit, and Satire of This:  
 A *Man's own Motions*, or Impulses indeed  
 may be *worldly* in the sinful Sense of the  
 Word, as 'tis plain This Writer here  
 means it; but to say Those of the *Holy*  
*Spirit* may be so, is, I think, *Blasphemy*.  
 " But if from *extraordinary* Motions,  
 " and Impulses of the Spirit, such as the  
 " *Service of God*, and *Good of Souls chiefly*  
 " *ly, &c.*" Now I think a *Man* may have  
 a Regard to the *Service of God*, and the  
*Good of Souls chiefly*, by the *ordinary*,  
 and without the *extraordinary* Motions,  
 or Impulses of the Spirit. What he says  
 here about the *inward Sense*, or *Feeling*,  
 (if he means *Perceiving*, or *Discerning*) of  
 the *Operations* of the Spirit by the *Fruits*  
 of the Spirit, is deny'd by nobody that I  
 know of; tho' quite impertinent to his  
 Purpose. But the Close of the Sentence is  
 curious.—" When it's Motions, and Im-  
 pulses are made the Subject of Banter,  
 " and Ridicule." Does Dr. T. then really  
 banter and ridicule the *Motions* and *Im-*  
 pulses of *God's Spirit*? If he does; what

a *Miscreant* must *He* be? If otherwise; what must *This Man* be, who *falsely charges* him with so *horrid a Sin* against the *Holy Ghost*? *He himself*, I am sure, speaks not very respectfully of the *Holy Ghost*, when he talks of *it's Motions*; making a *Thing*, not a *Person* of him. But *This*, I confess, with the *Blasphemy* above mentioned, might proceed from *Stupidity*, rather than *Design*.

The next Pamphlet is called *A proper Reply to the Anti-over-Righteous Dr. TRAPP's Sermons against Mr. WHITFIELD; or the Doctrine and Conduct of the Reverend Mr. WHITFIELD vindicated from the Aspersions, and malicious Invectives of his Enemys. Humbly submitted to the Consideration of the Publick.* Motto. *And the Chief Priests and Scribes stood round, and vehemently accused him,* Luke xxiii. 10. That is, the Body of the *Clergy* of the *Establish'd Church of England* are compared to the *Chief Priests, and Scribes*; and *Mr. Whitfield to our Saviour*. Many of these *pious Comparisons* we have had: Particularly, in *This very Pamphlet p. 14.* *Mr. Whitfield is affirmed to preach as one having Authority, and not as the Scribes.* But to go on. This *proper Reply* is, in truth, *no Reply*. *Dr. Trapp's Name* is mentioned in the Title Page; and *That's all relating to Him*: Excepting that he is charged

by the Writer as guilty of some flagitious Crime in not answering to a Charge brought against him by Mr. *Whitfield* in his Journal. The Reader shall have it in his own Words; it being perhaps one of the greatest Curiosities we have yet met with. *Introd.* P. 1, 2,

" It is not a little surprising, nor indeed a little shocking to sober Minds, that Dr. *Trapp* should stand charged, as he does in the Continuation of Mr. *Whitfield's Journal*, with several downright Falshoods; and yet be so regardless of a good Name, as not to spare a Line in his own Defence.—This is less to be accounted for, as there have been two Editions of his, &c. since That Charge against him was made to the World: And yet it stands in such full Force, as to impeach the whole Credit of the Work; and to render the Author, &c. Not a Word having been said to evade the Charge, or justify himself from an Accusation of so heinous a Nature; till the Dr. can prevail with himself to do this effectually, &c." Few Instances, I believe, can be given of such grave, solemn Impudence, join'd with such extreme Ignorance, and Folly. Because *Whitfield* had asserted a downright Falshood, among many other, by saying, in general Terms, that Dr. *T.* had asserted several downright Falshoods, and the Dr. had not vindicated himself, as it was

was impossible he should, unless he had been charged with *Particulars*; therefore it is surprising, shocking to sober Minds; He is regardless of a good Name; and so forth. This I say, is all that relates to Dr. T. in This proper Reply to his Sermons; unless you will take in the following Words p. 5. *Introd.* " Nor is it a little amazing that " this worthy Divine, who by this Time " must know the Town pretty well, he " being himself pretty well known to the " Town, &c. His being over-angry, or " rather over-envious at the great Applause " and Success his Brother *Whitfield* has met " with, &c." For the rest, This Pamphlet is nothing but a Panegyrick upon the great, and good Mr. *Whitfield*; and a most scurrilous and malicious Libel upon the Clergy of the establish'd Church: Both the Panegyrick and the Libel being made up of notorious *Lies*, which I leave to the Judgment of the World; only transcribing a few Sentences, for a Sample, or Specimen of the Whole. P. 5. " We shall not find " Him [*Whitfield*] in the Number of " those whose strongest Engagement to " their Godliness is GAIN." I appeal to any understanding Person, whether he does not think that *Whitfield* has, within these three Years, gather'd more Money, than one of the Generality of the Clergy receives from his Preferment, in twenty. What he collects

collects is said, indeed, to be for *Charity* : But how does that appear ? P. 9. " The Reverend Mr. Whitfield has nothing of " the *Self-sufficient*." Oh ! nothing at all. P. 10. " He is no *Creeper into Families*." Nothing like it, to be sure. P. 13. " He is in LEARNING not excelled, if equall'd by Any ; of superior Abilities to most of his Age." *Waterland*, for Example, to omit many others, is not worthy to carry his Books after him. P. 16. " He has been the Sport of the Drunkard ; a Subject of Reproach to Men of HIERARCHICAL Principles, and corrupt Minds." This needs no Remark.

The next has the following Title. Dr. TRAPP vindicated from the Imputation of being a CHRISTIAN. Occasioned by a Pamphlet of That Reverend Author against the METHODISTS ; entitled, the Nature, Folly, Sin, and Danger of being RIGHTEOUS OVER-MUCH. By a LOVER OF TRUTH. Seest thou a Man that is hasty in his Words ? There is more Hope of a Fool than of Him. Prov. xxix. 20. To This worthy Title Page I answer ; 1st, Dr. T. is not hasty in his Words ; but speaks the Words of Truth, and Soborness. 2dly, This LOVER OF TRUTH has not a Word of Truth, that is at all to the Purpose, in his whole Pamphlet. In which, 3dly, Tho' there be nothing that deserves an Answer in Point of Argumenta-

*Argumentation*, either as to Reason, or Fact; yet I think it might be very properly answered by a *Prosecution*, or an *Action at Law*, either in the *Commons*, or in *Westminster-Hall*: For tho' here be not the *Author's Name*, here is the *Bookseller's*. It is over and over asserted in the Title Page, and in the Body of the Book, that Dr. TRAPP (his Name printed at length) is NOT A CHRISTIAN. This sure is DEFAMATION in the *Eye of the Law*, and very high Defamation too; especially upon a Man of Dr. TRAPP's Profession, and Character. But no more of That at present. Even the *Methodistical Pamphleteers* against the Dr. cannot forbear, as you have seen, endeavouring to be witty. But this *Deist*, or *Papist* (for sometimes he seems to be the one, sometimes the other) is, in his own Conceit, a *Wit* all over. Every thing he writes is clean Satire, delicate Irony. And the 'Squire Quaker (of whom hereafter) flatters himself with the same Imagination. "Dr. TRAPP  
 " vindicated from the Imputation of being  
 " a Christian, &c." "A Congratulatory  
 " Letter to the Reverend Dr. TRAPP, &c." And both these fine Pieces proceed in the same Strain of Archness, and Gayety. This may pass with the Vulgar, and Injudicious: But such as are competent Judges of these Matters will distinguish between a Man of  
 real

*real Wit*, and an awkward, clumsy Pretender to it: One, with whom a Grimace goes for a Jest, and a dull impudent Lye for a Sarcasm; One, whose Attempts to be sharp and facetious, are as ridiculous as would be Those of a Cow endeavouring to gallop like a Race-Horse; or of a Country Clown exerting his Parts in a Dancing-School: One, in whose Scribble, stupid, and saucy, there seems to be a Strife for the Mastery, between the ignorant illiterate Dunce, and the pert pragmatical Coxcomb. I will produce some Strokes of our *Vindicator*'s polite Raillery, by which the Reader may judge of the Rest.

P. 11. "Besides; let it be consider'd, that  
 "the Dr. gets his Bread by Christianity,  
 "is by Profession one of the Church of  
 "England's Clergy, a Leader among them,  
 "and possess'd of Christian Benefices;  
 "which an open Opposition to Christianity  
 "would strip him of." P. 12. "A little  
 "Sincerity, where it suits one's Conve-  
 "nience, and Interest, is good, and righ-  
 "teous: But if it should obstruct an ad-  
 "ditional Benefice, stand in the Way of  
 "a good fat Bishoprick, &c. it is a  
 "GREAT Sin; it is being righteous over-  
 "much: And why should a Man destroy  
 "himself?" P. 19. "And here he lays  
 "about him, like a down-right Hero,  
 "knocking down one Text of Scripture  
 "with,

" with another, 'till he has quite spread  
 " the Field of Battle with the Carcasses  
 " of the slain, Methinks when I behold  
 " him triumphant in this Slaughter of  
 " Scripture, the Gospel in one Hand, the  
 " Epistles of St. *Paul* in the other,  
 " which with uncommon Dexterity he  
 " dashes against one another; I see that  
 " ancient Glory of *England*, the *London*  
 " 'Prentice still immortal on *British* Sign-  
 " Posts, with his Hands in the Throats of  
 " two Lions at once, to pluck out their  
 " Tongues. Oh may this second, *London*  
 " *Worthy* out-shine the Former; and hence-  
 " forth be immortaliz'd in this Reverend Pos-  
 " ture over every Ale-house, and Tavern;  
 " to remind those weak Christians, who  
 " still remain bigotted to *Sobriety*, that *He*  
 " whom They (and with them the Dr.  
 " out of *Complaisance*) call our blessed  
 " Saviour, *came eating, and drinking,*  
 " was present at Weddings, Feasts, and  
 " Entertainments, nay at one of them  
 " work'd a Miracle to make Wine. &c."  
 " P. 27. He [D. T.] is as serious as Don  
 " *Quixote* himself, when he rais'd an em-  
 " battled Flock of Sheep into an Army—  
 " O that some *Faith-denying Barber* might,  
 " without being *righteous over-much*, give  
 " up the *Self-Enjoyment* of his Bason. How  
 " well would it become the Reverend

" Head of an Anti-christian Parson!" [Pray observe by the Way how *ludicrously* and *profanely* This *Christian-Perfection* Man treats the most *serious*, and *sacred* Things.] P. 25. " A little Escape of this sort may now and then be excused in so *solid* a Divine; who does not often make a *Profession of Wit.*" Dr. TRAPP never made any *profession* of Wit; and, to be sure, *has* none: This Writer, you see, has a World of it.

I said above that he sometimes *appears* to be a *Deist*, sometimes a *Papist*. For the First, the *Deist*; besides his ludicrous, and profane Way of treating sacred Things just now taken Notice of; see his P. 14. " I consider'd his *Profession*; and reflected that it would be *over-righteousness* in him to bear with any one's stealing his TRADE from him." *Ibid. &c.*—Defending the Offices of his Function from the Encroachments of the Laity; only to put his Readers in Mind that, according to Protestant Principles, *every Lay-man has an equal Right with himself to the Exercise of that Function.*" No Christian, I think, would call the *Profession* of a *Clergyman*, or the *Office* of a *Priest*, by the Name of a *Trade*. And no Christian, in This Nation, would say that, according to Protestant Principles, there is no

no such Thing as *Priesthood at all.* Yet This Author, belike, is wonderfully concern'd for *Christian Perfection*; tho' *Infidelity*, and *Christian Perfection*, one would think, are not very consistent. But his Meaning is plain. He is sensible that the Doctrine of *Christian Perfection*, as stated by a late Writer, has done Mischief to the *Christian Religion*, and may probably do more: So he heartily closes with it; tho' that Writer certainly never intended to serve the Cause of Infidelity, but very much the Contrary. As to the Second, the *Papist*; Pray observe these Words, P. 8.  
 "The Church of *Rome*, which is the  
 "most ancient of all Pretenders to Chri-  
 "stianity." What is said in P. 16. 18.  
 31. 32. 33. about *private Judgment*, and  
*Church-Authority*, the *Means* employ'd  
 to bring about the *Reformation*, &c. which  
 I will not be at the Trouble of transcribing,  
 is plainly in Favour of the *Popish* Cause:  
 And it has been a hundred Times over  
 not only answer'd, but expos'd to the Scorn  
 of Mankind; and by few, or none, more  
 than by Dr. T. himself. To which I will  
 now add nothing; 'tis Foreign to my  
 Purpose: And these Triflers shall not make  
 me impertinent; tho' they themselves are  
 so. I only desire it may be observed that  
 such are the Defenders of the *Methodists*,

and the *Righteous over-much*, newly started up among us.

And now truly, I think I have almost done with This Pamphlet: For what remains is very little more than the Substance of the same Falshoods in *Reasoning*, and *Fact*, the same Misrepresentations, Misquotations, and malicious Slanders, which I have so often taken Notice of in the foregoing ones. The Author of This, like the Authors of Those, all along confounds being *too good* *strictly*, and *literally*, with being *so loosely* and *improperly speaking*; and *over-much Righteousness* with *Christian Perfection*. He represents the Dr. as being an Enemy to *extraordinary Degrees of Virtue*; because he is so to *Extraordinaries*, and *Excesses*, which are *Deviations from Virtue*: And abuses him, as being an *Advocate for Drunkenness, Uncharitableness to the Poor*, and in short all Manner of *Vice*, and *Immorality*. To cite the particular Passages would be in a Manner to transcribe the whole Pamphlet. As to other Matters, a small Gleaning only remains.

P. 5. " Upon which he very judiciously  
 " enquires, whether it be possible or not,  
 " to be *too good*, especially in these Times,"  
 This *Nonsense* is purely his own. If it be  
 possible to be *too good at all*; it is equally  
 so in *any times*. The Dr. says p. 1. *Can  
 we*

*we be too good? Or if that might be; is there ANY OCCASION, however, OF WARNING AGAINST it in these Times?* What is said P. 7. about the *Hebrew Word*, is false; and the Dr. is right: As Dictionarys, and Criticks shew. *Ibid.* “ And left from his “ Explanation of This any one should “ mistake him for a Christian; he takes “ care to exclude all Interpretations put “ upon this Text by any such as have been “ suspected to be tainted with Christian- “ nity; however natural such Interpretations may seem.” This is another Fals- hood. The Dr. recites many Interpretations, and does not exclude, or quite reject any of them: Only chuses to insist upon One, as the best.

In his Sermon P. 67, 68. He has these Words. “ How many are there, who being very rich, imagine they are charitable, if they now and then give a small Piece of Money to the Poor, when they ought to give *largly*, and *liberally!* “ who, under *Pretence of providing for their Families* are *shamefully covetous*, &c. Our Author P. 9. quoting the following Words of the Dr's in another Place; “ Thus for Instance Almsgiving is very excellent; but to bestow so much upon the Poor, as not to make *sufficient Provision* for one's *own Family* is a great Sin;” proceeds Thus, “ That is; Almsgiving, “ while

" while it is not *extraordinary*, nor ex-  
" tended to *more* than we are at a *Loss*  
" to know what to do with, is excellent,  
" very excellent: But when it exceeds the  
" *Ordinary*—'tis a Sin, a **GREAT SIN**—  
" For I dare say the Dr. would tremble at  
" the Thought of *every superfluous Far-*  
" *thing*, lavish'd on the Poor, which might  
" hinder him from *so much* towards his *suf-*  
" *ficient Provision* for his own Family."

This is your *Lover of Truth*; your zealous Pleader for *Christian Perfection*. It is true the Dr. recommends *making Provision* for *one's own Family*: Which This Man repeats, and *ridicules*, I believe, near twenty Times. Dr. T's other Adversaries shew their Dislike of it; and none more than the solemn Mr. Law. I desire my Readers to stop here a little; and think well of this Matter. Here seems to be a Confederacy against one of the great Supports of *human Society*, the Duty of Parents to provide for their Children; a Dictate not only of Scripture, but of common Reason, and the Law of Nature. What will *become of the World*, if these Men's Doctrines prevail? O but the Dr. said, not only *Provision*; but *sufficient Provision*. This has given Occasion to many a stinging Reflexion. A **SUFFICIENT Provision** for *one's own Family!* Was there ever the Like heard of? Ever any thing so monstrously absurd,

absurd, so monstrously wicked? What? Not only a *Provision* for one's Family; but a *sufficient Provision*? The indeterminate Meaning of the Word *sufficient* has been taken Notice of. P. 15. This Writer would change it for the Word *necessary*; and enlarges upon That Amendment with great Satisfaction, and Triumph: P. 9, 10. But is not That as ambiguous as the Word *sufficient*? May not a Man, if he has a Mind to flatter and deceive himself into *Uncharitableness towards the Poor*, as well say that 500, or 1000*l.* a Year is *necessary* for his Son, considering his Quality, and Station, as that no less is *sufficient* for him? Unless this Man's Meaning be that a Gentleman of such an Estate, or of five, or ten times as much, ought to leave no more to his Children than is *absolutely necessary* to keep Soul and Body together. If that be his Meaning (as, by the Way, 'tis plainly Mr. *Law's*) I say no more of it, but leave it to the Consideration of the Reader.

P. 12. "The Dr. indeed *winks at* their " going to Church upon ordinary Days."— The Dr. *advises* and *persuades* them to do it; which, it seems, is *winking at* their doing it.— "When their Business [the Dr. says as often as their NECESSARY Business] " will permit them: That is, in plain English, when they have nothing else to do."

And

And I say, in as plain *English*, This is a gross Falshood: as any one that can *read* plain *English* may see.

P. 13. He tells them *it is no great harm* “to employ a good Part of the Sunday in “Reading, Meditation, and Praying.” Another Falshood. The Dr. has no such Words, as *'tis no great harm*: He exhorts and persuades People to it. As to the main Substance of his crude Stuff P. 12, 13, 14. about *keeping the Sabbath*; Dr. T. acknowledges that he thinks the *Christian Sabbath* is not to be kept with the same *Rigour* and *Striētness*, as the *Jewish Sabbath* was: And let our Author make the most of the Concession.

P. 19, 20. Misrepresenting and perverting Dr. T's Words about the *Miracle of turning Water into Wine*, He, like his Brother Pamphleteer [see backwards P. 45, 46.] puts a most profane and blasphemous Reflexion upon our blessed Saviour: *Woolston* himself upon That Subject goes but little beyond him. “*When 'tis plain* [says the Dr.] “*that more had been drank, than was ab-* “*solutely necessary for the Support of Na-* “*ture*”—That there *had been*, I have shewn above. To which I now add, that admitting the Interpretation of Some, who suppose the Governor of the Feast to speak only of the general Custom of the World, not including the Persons then present (for which

which I see no manner of Reason; since the Interpretation is strain'd; and the Word ~~mebeue~~ in the Original sometimes signifies not *immoderate*, but only *cheerful* Drinking:) Even then, the *Tenour* of the *Narration*, particularly the *Want* of *Wine*, and a *fresh Supply* of it, shew that more was drank at That *Feast*, than was *absolutely necessary for the Support of Nature*. Our Author proceeds—“ And therefore at least enough.” The Words *at least* imply that it was rather *too much*. But suppose it was barely *enough*: Our Saviour made *more* afterwards: And *more than enough* is *too much*. But I need not deduce and infer This. Our Author says it in express Words: Nay he goes farther. “ Consequently, something (*more than enough*) had been indulged to *Pleasure*, and *Chearfulness*, when the miraculous *Wine* was drank.” He rises in the next Words. “ And therefore if Christ, whom they pretend to follow, wrought a Miracle in behalf of *Excess in drinking* for the sake of *Pleasure*, and *Chearfulness*, &c.” If he did; as he really did, according to this Man’s Account; not according to Dr. Trapp’s. But so much for This *Blasphemy*, which I tremble to repeat. Here again you have an Instance of this Writer’s Concern for *Christianity*, and *Christian Perfection*.

What follows, P. 20, 21,—26. relates chiefly to Mr. *Law*; to whom a distinct Answer will be return'd: And so we have nothing to do with it here. For the rest, a few Words will be sufficient.

P. 21. "The Dr. appeals to *Common Sense*; that is to the *Senses* of the *Common* of Mankind." And so again, P. 22. "The Dr. will answer that the Apostle overshot himself, &c. For we might as well have no Bodies at all, as not satisfy their Appetites; and what have we to do with Flesh, if we were not to fulfil *the Lusts thereof?* This is unanswerable to such as have *Common Sense*; or, to speak *English*, *Common Feeling*." How fair is this *Representation*! How accurate the *English*! How delicate the Turn of *Thought*!

P. 26. "The Dr. proves,—demonstrating, according to his usual Manner, by Assertion—." This is exactly true of *Himself*, and his *Brethren*; but most false of Dr. *Trapp*. He never begs the Question; never puts mere *Assertions* upon his Readers, instead of *Proofs*; as they do upon all Occasions.—"That Luxury and Covetousness are all that is forbidden." The Dr. Serm. p. 23. said that the *Arguments* brought by some Writers to prove that we must *enjoy nothing of this World*, conclude only against Luxury and Covetousness. Is this saying

saying that *Luxury and Covetousness are all that is forbidden?* But thus it is; when Men cannot, or will not, DISTINGUISH.

*Ibid.* The Dr. speaking of the Pomps and Vanities of this World, quotes those Words of our Liturgy in the Office of Baptism, " so as not to follow, or be led by " them." After the Word *led*, our Author adds, *by the Nose.* Pray observe both the *Wit*, and the *Decency*. The Expression in our Liturgy is not only used upon a most sacred Occasion ; but is taken from the Holy Scriptures.—*Carry'd away unto dumb Idols, even as ye were led,* 1 Cor. xii. 2.—*Led away by divers Lusts,* 2 Tim. iii. 6. So that this pretty profane Insertion [*by the Nose*] ridicules the Writings of St. Paul, as well as the Liturgy of the Church of *England*.

P. 33. He brings in a Papist saying ; " He [Dr. Trapp] has done us eminent Service by his Writings. At first indeed we suspected him to be an Enemy from certain—Expressions—But they were only a Mask to cover his good Will towards us—For the very Book he undertook to write against us in Defence of the Church of *England*, was of so much Credit, and Service to us, that we have reason to look upon him as one of our best Missioners in *England*. Nay, he

" has brought us over more Converts than  
 " twenty of them have done. And I don't  
 " doubt but this very Pamphlet was writ-  
 " ten with a Design to do us Service." If  
 this be true; why are the Papists (as appears  
 by their Writings) so *enraged* against him?  
 But I say no more, than that this is *soon*  
*said*; and let the *World* judge.

P. 36. Referring to those Words of the Doctor's—*The establish'd Church is the Fortress, or the strong Hold of the Christian Religion; and the Clergy the Garrison, or Soldiers that defend it*: He subjoins, “Now  
 “ as He has already inform'd us that this  
 “ strongest Hold of Christian Religion is  
 “ very much out of Repair, &c.” The Dr. indeed has said in another Place, that the Church is, by *irregular upstart Societies*,  
 “ greatly weaken'd and impair'd.” Upon which, this Writer is triumphantly facetious. P. 31, 32. and here he is at it again.  
 “ The Consequence (says he, p. 31.) is,  
 “ that either it wants Repairing, or is past  
 “ it.” Not past it; tho' wanting it, if he pleases. The *Garrison* may be *much* out of Repair;  
 nay *very much*; tho' Dr. T. does not say so: And yet be able to *hold out*, and defend itself against all its Enemies. He goes on here, p. 36.—“ And the Garrison made  
 “ out of a Parcel of *raw Novices*.” How, and where does Dr. T. INFORM us of This? He *mentions* ONE *raw Novice*, who, being  
 about

about 23 Years of Age, and newly in Deacon's Orders, had the Impudence to censure the whole Body of the Clergy: Therefore, belike, (for I can deduce it from Nothing else) he informs us that this Garrison, the Church, is made out of a Parcel of raw Novices. Here, by the way, we take notice of something which was pass'd over before. "Mark (says he, p. 17.) the pretty Joke upon the Church of *England* concerning holy Orders on raw Novices." Why truly, a Youth of three and twenty may be well enough qualify'd for Deacon's Orders; and yet be a raw, a very raw Novice, if compar'd with all the learned Clergy of *England*. Besides; should This, or That particular Bishop confer Orders upon one not duly qualify'd; the Church of *England* is not answerable for it.

What he says, p. 38. about *Law-suits*, and the Dr's, being READY TO SWEAR, that Christ speaks Hyperbolically, &c. I desire the Reader to peruse, if he thinks it worth his while; and then 'tis answer'd.

Only one Pamphlet more now remains, if that may be said to remain; for a worthy Gentleman, the ingenious Mr. *Bate*, has, I thank him, in a great measure taken it off my Hands. This is intituled, *A Congratulatory Letter to the Rev. Dr. TRAPP: Occasioned by his four Sermons against Enthusiasm. In which the Rev. Mr. BATE's Notions*

*Notions of the Co-operation of the Spirit are examined and refuted.* By T. S—y, Esq; Mr. *Bate* reply'd to this, in Defence both of Dr. *T.* and himself; which produced a tedious Answer from the *Quaker* 'Squire, (for let him pretend what he pleases, a *Quaker* he plainly is, or if not a *Quaker*, a *Papist*, or a *Deist*) consisting of 176 Pages, with the *Letter to the Bishop of LONDON* prefixed; as the Congratulatory Letter itself does of 112. To this likewise Mr. *Bate* has, in the *Weekly Miscellany* of May 10 last, given what he truly calls a *sufficient Reply*, as to what concerns himself: All I have to do is to vindicate Dr. *T.* in those Points, concerning which this 'Squire pretends to have reply'd to Mr. *Bate's* Defence.

The Doctor, speaking of the common People's being *Admirers of Novelty*, had said, incidentally, and in passing, that *Truth is the oldest Thing in the World*; and that in Religion, and Morality, whatever is really new is certainly false. The Letter-Writer, in seven Pages of *Sophistry*, proceeding either from *Ignorance*, or *Fraud*, explodes these Words, as most absurd, and most wicked; as " quite overturning not " only the Law of *Moses*, and the *Christian Revelation*, [which, by the bye, he himself all along makes his utmost Efforts to destroy] " but every thing else it:

“ it has pleased God to discover to Man-  
 “ kind, as a Duty, from, or near the Be-  
 “ ginning of the World to this Time ; be-  
 “ cause these Revelations were new to  
 “ Men, when first made known to them,  
 “ and consequently false, if the Doctor’s  
 “ Reasoning be true.” *Congrat. Letter,*  
 P. 36. A Reader of no extraordinary Sa-  
 gacity may easily perceive that the Doctor’s  
 Meaning is no more than this ; that *Inno-  
 vations* in Morality and Religion, (in the  
 true Religion, which is now no other than  
 the *Christian*) all *novel Doctrines* and  
*Practices*, all *spurious Additaments*, made  
 by the *Humours* and *Fancies* of some MEN,  
 who profess that Religion, are false, and  
 erroneous. Does he therefore *countenance  
 Deism* ? or deny that GOD could make  
 new *Revelations* ? or affirm that if he  
 should, those *Revelations* would be *false* ?  
 He said, *Truth is the oldest Thing in the  
 World.* General Truth (to which all par-  
 ticular ones have Reference) certainly is so :  
 It is older than the World ; It is Eternal.  
 To the Word *new* the Dr. added *really* :  
 Because some Things are *pretended* to be  
*new* in Religion, which *really* are not :  
 The Papists, for Instance, charge us with  
 being *Innovators* ; whereas in reality they  
 are the *Innovators* themselves. But what  
 Occasion had the Dr. just making this Re-  
 flection by the way, to *define*, and *explain*,

as

as this *Sophister* pretends he ought to have done? See him now swaggering with this confident Assertion; *Defence*, P. 111. "His Words amount to nothing less than " *Deism in Epitome, or the absolute Denial* " *of all Revelations, that are not of an* " *equal, or elder Date than Truth.* This, " Sir, is, and must be their Meaning, so " long as these Words (*Truth is the oldest* " *Thing in the World*) stand in the Sen- " tence; in spight of every thing which " the *Doctor*, and all his Friends put toge- " ther are able to say to the contrary." I think I have been able to say something to the contrary; and as much as is abundantly sufficient.

As to the *Evidence of Inspiration*; Dr. T. no where says, (what our 'Squire all along supposes) that *Miracles* are necessary Evidence to the inspir'd Person *himself*; but that they are necessary to convince *others* that he is inspired. God gave to his Prophets different Proofs of *their own Inspiration*; as by *Dreams, Visions, a vocal Call, &c.* Not but that even these, tho' not generally called so, may, in a *wide Sense*, be deem'd *Miracles*, as being wrought by *God in a supernatural Manner*. For a full Account of this Matter, I mean the *Evidences of Inspiration*, both to the *inspir'd Person himself*, and to those whom he endeavours to satisfy that he is inspired;

see

see the very ingenious, learned, and judicious Mr. Bayley of Bristol's ESSAY ON INSPIRATION: Which if our Letter-Writer had read, and understood; perhaps his indigested Heap of Absurdities, upon this Subject, had been spared. If the Man, who fancies himself inspired, has *real, clear Proof, and Evidence* that he *is so*; he may certainly communicate it to *any body else*: And therefore what our Author says about a *blind Man*, and *Colours*, is nothing to the Purpose: As is what he says about *Metaphorical Expressions* in Scripture, which nobody denies: But 'tis one thing to *use* a Metaphor, and another to *form an Argument* from it. Nor does the *Seeing*, or *Feeling*, which they talk of, supposing it to be metaphorical, come up to the Point in hand. *I am inspir'd*, is a *Proposition*: And can we, in *any Sense*, feel a *Proposition*? No; we must *prove* it; and if we can prove it to *ourselves*, we may prove it to *all the World*. But of this enough in the Answer to Mr. Seagrave; \* to which I refer. I will not be guilty of *endless Repetition*; tho' I have been forced to a *great deal*. Mr. Bate, however, does not leave the poor *Doctor in the Lurch* [as is said, Defence, P. 112.] by not answering several Arguments, &c. He has not left him in a *Labyrinth of Error, and Nonsense.*

L

sense.

\* See Appendix.

sense, P. 120. Nor has the Doctor been guilty of any *Mistakes, and Blunders, which to Common Sense appear altogether indefensible*, P. 112. These are Scurrilities, and Lies, thrown out of course, without any Show of Reason, or Argument.

This Writer had no Occasion to be so gay, and triumphant about the *Evidence of Miracles, and the Nature of the Doctrine* taught, as compared with each other, (upon which Subject, by the way, he teaches *false Doctrine* himself) nor to treat the Doctor with such ill-manner'd *Scorn* upon that Article. He pretends, [Def. P. 119.] that his chief Design was to "exercise the " Skill, and unparallell'd Mildness of that " meek, and charitable Gentleman, to " whom he was writing." This *insolent Contempt* is a perfect Outrage upon common Decency. Dr. Trapp's Skill has been long since publickly exercis'd upon this very Subject of *Miracles*; \* as well as upon many others of great Importance, and no small Difficulty. " As I make no Doubt, says " our Author, [Congrat. Letter, P. 48.] " that you are more able to enter into " this knotty Point [*Miracles*] than him, " [Mr. Locke] or any other Person; I " hope to see your grey Hairs adorn'd, and " the World blessed with so-useful an Un- " dertaking."

\* Discourse upon the Parable of *Dives and Lazarus.*

"dertaking." Besides what Dr. T. has already publish'd, as above; it happens that long before his *Hairs* were so grey as they now are, even before they were grey at all, he had more minutely, tho' briefly, discuss'd this Subject; particularly, balancing against each other the different Degrees of external Evidence in the Miracles, and of internal in the Doctrines: And the World perhaps may, one Time or other, be presented, I do not say bless'd, with so useful an Undertaking.

In his Defence, P. 139. He has a mighty mind to contradict Bishop Bull, and Mr. Bate: He would contradict them, if he knew how; but in truth only contradicts himself. For he in Effect says what they say; and yet pronounces them mistaken: "The Spirit of God (says he) bears Testimony both to, and with our Spirits." Be it so: Still 'tis with, as well as to: Here is a *Co-Testimony*; which is all they affirm. He proceeds. "God immediately infuses Joy, and Gladness into the Soul; whereby he testifies to it his Approbation, &c." By this I suppose he meant to say that the Spirit begins the Witnessing. It may be so sometimes: Bishop Bull says it is so in the Case of pious Christians clouded with Melancholy; when the Holy Spirit enlightens and irradiates their Minds. In what follows he allows the joint Witness-

sing, and Concurrence of God's Spirit, and ours : And whom then does he oppose ? His rude, abusive Language, both upon Bishop Bull, and Mr. Bate, is shameful. I will produce but one Instance. "Bishop Bull was doubtless a great Man [mighty courteous to acknowledge so much of a Man whose invaluable Works are the *Admiration of Christendom!*] " yet this Sentiment " of his is no Proof \* ON [of] it : It " proves rather his own Ignorance of true " Religion." Very modest indeed ! One of the most learned, acute, and judicious Divines that ever lived, exemplary for Piety, Charity, and all Christian Virtues, was ignorant of true Religion ; because this Child of Obscurity is pleas'd to say so.

I had almost forgot the remarkable Blunders, with which he charges Dr. T. at the Conclusion of his *Congratulatory Letter*. The Dr. denies extraordinary Inspiration in these Times ; yet says, *Let us earnestly beseech God to send forth his Light, and his Truth, that we may all fully discover these Depths of Satan, &c.* Which (according to our Author) cannot be done without extraordinary Inspiration ; and therefore (according to the Dr.) Miracles are requir'd to prove it. This I deny. The ordinary Assistance of God's Spirit, join'd with our own

\* It would be tedious to take Notice of his false English in both his Pamphlets.

own sincere Endeavours, will enable us to discover any Depths of Satan, relating to us : And what does this Man say to prove the contrary ? Nothing at all. Another pretended *Blunder*, or *Inconsistency* of the Doctor's is, that he allows these Delusions to be *Depths of Satan* ; " which (says our " Letter-Writer) does but ill agree with " the many Fools, and Blockheads you " have called him, and his Followers, in " the preceding Pages." Dr. T. call'd *nobody* Fool, or Blockhead ; much less did he call *Satan* so. Yes ; but he says the *Proceedings* of these deluded by him are *so ridiculous as to create the greatest Laughter* ; and then, " He needed not have put his " Flock on praying for *extraordinary Light, and Assistance*, to discover a " Thing in itself obvious enough to all such " as will take the Pains to think about it." I answer, 1<sup>st</sup>, the Dr. does not put them upon praying for *extraordinary Light, and Assistance* ; tho' this Writer not only puts those Words upon him, but prints them in emphatical Italick. 2<sup>dly</sup>, It requires great *Depth, Cunning, and Subtily*, to deceive even the *Common People* in the *plainest Cases* ; and to make them lay aside the Use of *Common Sense*, so as *not to think at all*, or *not to think truly* about them. It may require great *Sagacity* in *Satan*, to deceive them in such *plain Cases* : And yet their  
*Actions*

*Actions*, in Consequence of such Deception, may be very ridiculous, as well as detestable; and appear so to one of no great Depth, who is not under the same Delusion. Judge now which of the two is the *Blunderer*; the *Doctor*, or he who accuses him of *Blundering*.

What he alledges against Mr. *Bate's* saying that the Quakers [and other Dissenters] are tolerated and protected by the *Church*, is very idle. No, says he; 'tis by the *State*, not by the *Church*. As if the King, [or Queen] and both Houses of Parliament, were not of the *Church*, as well as the *State of England*. 'Tis by *Churchmen*, and some *Clergymen* too, that the Toleration is granted.

It would take up a Volume (for many *Words* must be used, tho' the *Thing* be never so easy) to answer all his *Cavils*, *Chicaneries*, and *false Doctrines* upon (as he himself owns) *half a Dozen Subjects of the greatest Moment*. Besides; they have been answer'd an hundred Times over by our learned Divines in their Controversies with Papists, Quakers, other Hereticks, and Enthusiasts, Deists, and Infidels. Particularly, the Texts he alledges to prove *private Inspiration*, and several more of the same Kind, have been shewn to prove *no such Thing* by Dr. *Hammond* in his Discourse upon the pretended *New Light* prefixed to his

his *Annotations on the New Testament*; by Mr. *Lesley*; Dr. *Bennet*, and Others. Must we be *always* doing the *same Thing*, which has been *so often* done *already*; when ever any impertinent, confident, *Nobody knows who*, is pleas'd to impose that Task upon us? Have we nothing else to do with our *Time*?

No more now remains by way of *Answer*; I shall only make some short promiscuous Observations upon this Writer, and his two Pamphlets. The Second of which, by the way, makes a *Seventh* against Dr. *T's Sermons*; so that, with Mr. *Law's*, there are *Eight* in all.

Nothing can be more ridiculous, than his calling the Church of *England* (as he does all along) **OUR CHURCH**; as if **HE** were a Member of it. What a choice Member of the Church of *England* must **He** be, who shew's his *Dislike* (to put it at the lowest) of *Water-Baptism*; the *Establishment* of the Church by *human Laws*; the *Constitution* of *any Church* at all; *Forms of Prayer*; the *Athanaian Creed*, and the *Doctrine of the Trinity*! Who represents our Church and Clergy as being of a *persecuting Spirit*, than which nothing can be more false and scandalous: Who lessens and depreciates, and seems, at leaft, to deny the instituted *Means of Grace*, as in the *Lord's Supper*; who thinks *That Sacra-  
ment*

ment to be of no more Importance, than what the PLAIN ACCOUNT thereof judiciously gives it; which Plain Account has been abundantly proved by learned Writers to be contrary to the Christian Religion, and the Doctrine of our own Church in particular: Who approves of the silent Meetings of the Quakers: Who insists upon the private Inspiration of particular Persons, denying the Holy Scriptures to be perfect, and an entire Rule of Faith, and Practise to us: Who endeavours to weaken the Evidence of Miracles, upon which the whole Fabrick of the Christian Religion is founded: Who denies that holy Orders are necessary to confer a Commission for the Work of the Ministry: Who speaking thus in the Apostle's Language, [Congrat. Letter, p. 16.] *Those who watch for their Souls,* adds these Words, i. e. their M—y. St. Paul, it seems, when he said *watch for your SOULS,* meant *Watch for your MONEY.* Can this Man be deem'd a Member of our Church? Or really, and sincerely of any Church at all? Can he be deem'd a Christian?

To his *Congratulatory Letter* he has added an *Appendix* concerning a Letter in the *Weekly Miscellany* about Dr. T's Sermon upon *Religious Zeal.* This Appendix, by the Airs he gives himself, he takes to be most *ingenious Irony;* as I, on the other hand,

hand, take it to be very *dull Buffoonery*. The only Use I make of it is to observe once more, that he, and all the Doctor's Adversaries are perpetually *abusing* him, as being *cholerick, hot, hasty, bitter*, and the like ; for no Reason, that I could ever see, but because he is *in earnest, truly, and honestly zealous* in the Cause of God, and Religion ; and, upon proper Occasions, *sharp, and severe*. The *Enemies of God, and Religion*, in the mean while, may spit out the Venom of a thousand Serpents against the Defenders of *Both* ; with all the ill Breeding, *Vitulence, Malice, Lying, and Slander imaginable*, vilify and calumhiate them ; and all, belike, is very well : *They* are not in the least *cholerick, hot, hasty, or bitter*. But of this the Doctor has given a full Account in the Sermon aforesaid ; to which I refer : And (being quite tired) will add no more than this ; that I hope the Reader has *pity'd me*, while I have been toiling through so many *wicked, as well as foolish Pamphlets*, such a Medley of Enthusiasm, Hypocrify, Popery, Infidelity, and Blasphemy ; which would never have been endur'd in any Christian *Country*, but *Ours* ; nor in *Ours* neither, in any *Times*, but *These*.

## APPENDIX.

M

# APPENDIX.

*From the WEEKLY MISCELLANY,  
refer'd to p. I.*

*Mr. HOOKER,*

N these strange Times, when all Regards to *common Decency* are laid aside ; Those who write, and publish any thing for the Good of Mankind, find themselves under a difficulty about *Answering*, or *not Answering* what every half-witted Murderer of Paper is pleased to scrawl out against them. If they *do not* answer him ; he triumphs, as if they *could not* : If they *do* ; they honour him too much, and make him look somewhat considerable. There is, however, a *Kind of Medium* between these Two ; and I shall make use of it with reference to a Pamphlet lately publish'd, and call'd *An Answer to the Rev. Dr. TRAPP's four Sermons against Mr. WHITEFIELD : Shewing the Sin and Folly of being Angry over-much, &c.* By ROBERT SEAGRAVE, M. A. The Doctor, to my Knowledge, thinks it does not become him to make any Reply,

Reply, in his own Name, and Person, to this Writer ; tho' so important a one in his own Conceit. He will say, I know, that this very Letter is written by the Doctor himself : Let him say so ; I neither affirm, nor deny it : However, it is written to *you*, Mr. Hooker, not to *him* ; and so there is some Decency preserv'd.

*Against Mr. Whitefield.* Why against Him *only*? Does Dr. T. once mention his Name? And is *He* the only *Righteous over-much*; the only *Enthusiast* in the Kingdom?

*Shewing the Sin and Folly of being Angry over-much.* How he *shews* this, in his Pamphlet, I see not ; he does not say *one Word about it*. Doubtless to be *Angry over-much* is a great Sin, and Folly : But how is Dr. T. so in this Discourse? I appeal to the World ; and that is Answer sufficient. But this is always said upon these Occasions, by those who have nothing else to say. If a Man with a *prudent Christian Warmth*, and *Zeal*, join'd with the clearest Reasoning, expresses himself *sharply*, against the most pernicious Doctrines, and Practises ; he is angry presently, he is in a *Pas-sion*: *Angry* if you please, in *some Degree* ; He *ought* to be so : But not in a *Passion* ; not *Angry over-much*.

A great Part of what he calls his Answer to Dr. T. relates not to *him* in particular,

but to the Church of *England Clergy in general*; whom he abuses with much Rudeness, and Insolence; at the same time paying his Compliments to the *Dissenters*; as if the Learning, and Orthodoxy of the Nation rested chiefly, nay almost only, in them. What a Church of *England Clergyman* is this?

His reflecting upon Dr. T. p. 1, 2. for not appearing against Mr. Whitefield, 'till he had left the City, or the Kingdom (for I know not what he means by those Words *amongst us*) for not taking the Field sooner, as if Mr. WHITEFIELD were so formidable an ADVERSARY to Dr. Trapp, (supposing he appear'd against him *only*, which the Discourse itself shews to be most false) is beyond measure childish, and silly; admitting it were *true*: But, as it happens, all the Town knows it to be *otherwise*.

P. 3. " Our Author (says he) has chose  
 " his Text, very judiciously it must be al-  
 " low'd, with a View to this Purpose;  
 " that is, in hope that his Reader will sup-  
 " ply the Application, and carry it *for him*  
 " to the Case before us without any Hes-  
 " tation: But no intelligent Reader will  
 " be catch'd at this rate." He must be a  
 more *intelligent Reader* than I am, who  
 can tell what he means by all this; and so  
 I say no more of it. " He must perceive  
 " distinctly that the Dr. proves his *in-*  
*tended*

" tended Object Mr. W. [what *Language*  
 " does the Man write ?] to be under such  
 " Predicament, either out of his Practise,  
 " &c. Does he this? not at all." This is  
 a notorious Falshood in Fact; and any body  
 that has *Eyes* may see it. " Rather he  
 " (Mr. W.) has expressly disclaim'd, and  
 " disavow'd all *real Extravagancies*."  
 What if he does? He *commits* them, while  
 he *disclaims*, and *disavows* them: " He  
 " does not let People from their Work."  
 This again is notoriously false in Fact. He  
 does let People from their Work; and does  
 much Mischief that Way.

What he says, P. 3, 4. of the Dr's quo-  
 ting a Passage from a Writer who is not a  
*Methodist*, is most impertinent and senseless.  
 Does the Dr. once mention that foolish  
 Word *Methodist*? He speaks of all *Righ-  
 teous over-much*, and *Enthusiasts*, whether  
 Methodists or no, whether ancient or mo-  
 dern; tho' with a more peculiar View to  
 the latter.

P. 4. " It seems there are more Myste-  
 " ries of Iniquity besides Popery." Doubt-  
 less there are; but what is this to the Pur-  
 pose? What he means by the next Words,  
 I know not. Whatever they mean; they  
 relate not to Dr. T. in particular.

P. 5. " The Dr's desultory manner of  
 " writing." How unfortunate is it for  
 Dr. T. that he was not instructed by the  
 great

great Mr. Seagrave in the *Manner* and *Method* of Writing !

The strange Crudities in p. 6, 7, 13. about Churches, Field-preaching, Consecrated Ground, Whitefield's being denied the Use of Pulpits, &c. are Circumstances which have been sufficiently taken notice of, Mr. Hooker, in some of your former Papers ; to which I have no more to add, but that Ignorance and Impudence in conjunction are prodigious Things.

P. 7. "What Danger this involves to the real Gospel—" says he : and what English is this ? say I. *Coincide with the Majority of his Brethren* is another quaint Expression.

His Glosses upon the Text, *Righteous over-much*, &c. as if it imply'd such, and such Things as he puts upon it, p. 6, 7, 8, as also p. 28 to the End, are no better than stark, staring Nonsense : For the Truth of which I appeal to the *Common-Sense* of all Readers.

P. 8. What he says about *Christians relying upon their own virtuous Performances*, when (as he imagines) they should refer all to *Christ*, is downright *Antinomianism*, and destructive of a holy Life. And he harps upon the same String in other Parts of his Pamphlet.

Ibid. "Why should we confine all Religion and all Learning to our own Church?"

Church?" Why indeed? And who among us does so?

P. 8, 9. "A Few at the Head of implicit Numbers, either in Church, or State, have possibly committed more Depredations upon Truth, than has any other Accident beneath the Sun." This I recommend to all my Countrymen, as a standard both of *Sense*, and *Language*.

The Remainder of p. 9, and part of the 10th let the Reader peruse, if he pleases: For my self, I can find nothing there, with any sort of Meaning, except false and scandalous Reflections upon the Church of *England*, and Compliments upon his dearly beloved Dissenters.

P. 10, 11. Dr. T. said that he heard these *Righteous over-much* had made some People mad. The Fact is true: All the Town knows it. As to our Author's Story about one *Periam*, whom I never heard of before, and his wife and most Philosophical Observations upon it; let him, who shall think it worth his while, read it, and laugh at it. I only add these other Specimens of his admirable Stile: "The same Point is credited by many:—Entirely latter to the original Disorder"—A reigning *Incident*.

P. 12. "Great and undoubted Reformation has arisen upon the Manners of the Age (wonderfully express'd again!) " by "the

“ the *Itinerant's Preaching.*” This is another gross Falsehood in Fact; unless the Manners of the Age are reform'd by *Idle-ness, and Frenzy.*

P. 13. “ Suppose it should be true, that Popery and Fanaticism are themselves on this Occasion properly the Root out Ecclesiasticks speak from, for what is Popery, but &c.” Whether the *Sense* or the *Language*, be here the more extraordinary, I will not presume to determine. So again p. 14. *Their own constituent Articles.* *Ibid.* “ I hope I have cleared away the Circumstances of the present Controversy.” *Pluralities* are here reflected upon, and called *Enormities*. This is the stale Topick of every ignorant Creature who hates the Church. *Pluralities* are necessary in many Cases, highly expedient in others; nor could the Church well subsist without them: As the learned Mr. Wharton has fully proved in his *Defence of Pluralities.*

To our Charging the Methodists (as he calls them) with *Novelty*, he answers p. 15. that the *Gospel* was charged with the same. Yes; But That Charge was not true: This is.

P. 15. “ Tho' their Persuasion of being inspired may be supported by no Evidence or Proof to Dr. T. and others of his Cast; it may be abundantly evident to these

" these Persons themselves and their Followers." How it can be evident to their Followers; unless those Followers are inspir'd too, or see some Miracle wrought by them, I cannot imagine. And as to *Themselves*; Dr. T. said, they have no Evidence of their being inspired by God, unless a strong Persuasion may it self pass for Evidence. This Gentleman says, it may be evident to *them*; tho' not to Dr. T. and such as he is. I answer; it cannot be evident to Dr. T. or any other besides themselves, without Miracles: Nor to Themselves neither, without such Evidence as they can communicate to others; unless they can communicate it to others, the Evidence they talk of is no Evidence at all; but a mere Persuasion only. What he says through all the next Page " about a Person's feeling, and enjoying a Sensation in his own Breast, which it may not be possible for him to make another sensible of," is nothing to the Point. We are speaking of Reason and Proof, not of Sensation and Enjoyment; not of any Feeling whether metaphorical, or real; whether outward, or inward. *I am inspired by God* is a Proposition; a Proposition about matter of Fact: And can we feel, or enjoy a Proposition? feel a Proposition about a Matter of Fact to be true? No; we must prove it by Evidence: And if we can prove it to ourselves, we may impart that Proof to any body

*body else.* Whether the Proof be good, or not, is indeed another Question. It can, in truth, be no Proof to the other Person; (Nothing but *Miracles* can reasonably satisfy him;) though it may be a good one to *Ourselves*. But we may tell him how we prove it to *Ourselves*, and make him very well *understand* us; tho' upon our bare Word he is not bound to *believe* us. In the same Page, he puts a false Quotation upon us; which proceeded either from *Fraud*, or from the most *undistinguishing Stupidity*. Those Words of Dr. T. 'Tis perfect *Phrenzy*; *all the World knows it to be false*; relate not to their bare Pretence of feeling the extraordinary Impulses of the Spirit; (tho' that's *Phrenzy* enough) but to their saying (supposing them to say so) " that " they see the Light of the Spirit within " them, in as strict, proper, and literal a " Sense, as we see the Light of the Sun, &c." To affirm which is certainly *Frenzy*; and *all the World knows it to be false*. And now let us see our Author's next Words. " Does " Dr. T. feel then for every Body? And " has every Body in the World communica- " cated to him what their Opinion, or Ap- " prehension is of this Matter?" No; but in that Passage he appeals to all the World, whether it be not false and frantick, to say that the Light of the Spirit may be seen in as strict, proper, and literal a Sense, as the

the *Light* of the *Sun*. And so much for the *Sophistry* about the *Evidence* of the pretended *Inspiration*.

P. 17. "The Grace of God is nothing less than Inspiration in some Shape or another." The *Shape* of *Inspiration* is a pretty odd *Expression*; but of the *Assertion* itself we shall speak in a more proper Place.

P. 18. "To convince Dr. T. as a Divine, how precipitately he has delivered himself against Inspiration" (Magisterial enough; but proper, no doubt, from such a *Superior*,) "and against any Feeling of the Spirit, &c." he "offers to his Reflection the 17th Article." The Article says, "such as *FEEL* in themselves the *Working* of the *Spirit* of *Christ*." Read the very next Words; *mortifying the Works of the Flesh, and their earthly Members; and drawing up their Mind to high, and heavenly Things*. Who denies (Dr. T. I am sure, does not) the *feeling*, or *perceiving* of the *Spirit*, and his *Presence* with us, by his *ordinary Operations* exciting, and enabling us to live a *holy Life*? We thus *feel* the *Spirit* by *perceiving* we are *good Christians*; because without *Him* we know we could not be *so*. Do Mr. W. and the rest of them, when they talk of the *Spirit*, mean no more than the *ordinary Grace of God*? If so; our Dispute with them upon that Head is over.

P. 20, "Now the Dr. argues against ANY  
 " Inspiration, unless it be attended with  
 " Miracles." This is utterly false; Inspiration  
 is twofold, *Ordinary*, and *Extraordinary*. The Grace of God is *ordinary*  
 Inspiration, against which Dr. T. does not  
 argue; nor is he speaking of *that*, when  
 he asks the Question, Do they work Miracles? So that Mr. S's Recital of the two  
 Collects, in which the Word *Inspiration*,  
 (meaning ordinary Inspiration, the Grace of  
 God) is mention'd, was altogether impertinent. [As was, by the way, his Recital  
 of another Collect with respect to the  
*New Birth*. What Divine of the Church  
 of *England* denies the *New Birth*?] But  
*extraordinary Inspiration* (of which alone  
 the Dr. was there speaking) ought to be  
 made evident to the Person himself by some  
 clear Proof, and to others by Miracles.  
*Ibid.* "The Office for ordaining Deacons  
 " expressly says, *Do you trust that you are*  
 " *moved by the HOLY GHOST?*" Meaning, say  
 I, the *ordinary* Motions of the *Holy Ghost*,  
 not the *extraordinary*. And so Mr. S's  
 formal Argumentation, "Now give me  
 " *Leave, &c.*" might well have been sparred.  
 I agree with him that the *Holy Ghost*  
 is concern'd IN (for I would say IN, which  
 is Sense, not UNDER) the Work of Regenera-  
 tion to make a real Christian; as well as  
 in

in the Work of Ordination to make a real Minister.

P. 21. "Indeed the Dr. speaking against  
 " ANY Impulses or Assurances of the Spirit,"  
 [This is utterly false, as we have partly  
 seen, and partly shall see] "would seem  
 " himself to allow something of that Do-  
 "ctrine," that is, the Grace of God. "But  
 " then presently" (i. e. presently BEFORE)  
 " demonstrates he meant it not at all." Here, and in what follows, the Dr. is accus'd  
 of Hypocrisy, Prevarication, and Self-Con-  
 tradiction. Let us see Why. "There is  
 " (says he) such a thing as the Operation,  
 " and Influence of the Holy Spirit upon  
 " our Souls, tho' we cannot distinguish it  
 " (the Article says otherwise, that such FEEL,  
 " &c.) This, I answer, has been accounted  
 for already) "from the Operations of our  
 " Minds, is not only granted but, &c. This  
 " looks right, I easily grant. But take  
 " what he says on this Head in the other  
 " Paragraph" [ 'Tis the same Paragraph]  
 " of the same Page along with it. This  
 " now, [This Impulse, or Operation of the  
 Spirit] This? Which? The Dr. is here  
 speaking not of ordinary, but extraordinary Impulse; and this Writer, to make  
 him contradict himself, represents him, as  
 speaking of ordinary Grace — "if any  
 " thing more be meant by it — than a  
 " good Conscience, and the Comforts of the  
 " Holy

" Holy Ghost consequent upon it (which  
 " who denies?) is perfect Enthusiasm, &c.  
 " Now if this be not faying, and unfaying  
 " in Religion, and really disbelieving the  
 " Point in every Shape; I appeal to the  
 " meanest Reader, who will examine this  
 " Passage with the least Attention." Had  
 this Writer himself examin'd it with the  
 least Attention, join'd with the least Judg-  
 ment, and Honesty; he had not made this  
 hideous abusive Outcry without any sort of  
 Occasion given him. The Case stands plainly  
 thus. In one place the Dr. allows the or-  
 dinary, powerful, tho' unperceiv'd, Opera-  
 tions of the Holy Spirit, or in different  
 Words, *the Grace of God*: In the other Place  
 he disallows the *extraordinary* inward *Feel-*  
*ing, Hearing, and Seeing.* Where is the  
 Contradiction; the Saying, and Unsaying?  
 How is this really disbelieving the Grace of  
 God, and Inspiration in every Shape?

He goes on p. 22. " A good Conscience!  
 " Does this come up to the Sense of the  
 " Article, and the Collects I have quoted?"  
 It cannot well *come up to it*; because it  
 has *nothing to do with it*. But distinguishing  
 one thing from another is not our Au-  
 thor's Talent. " And the Comforts of the  
 " Holy Ghost consequent upon it! The  
 " Reader will observe the Dr. makes the  
 " Comforts of the Holy Ghost *dependent*  
 " upon the Conscience of a Christian." The  
 Dr.

Dr. does not say *dependent*, but *consequent*; and 'tis true that the Comforts of the Holy Spirit *follow* upon a good Conscience.—

“ And in effect no other than, or different from, his Conscience.” [This or different from is no Sense: But That by the Way.] That is; *two things*, one of which is *consequent* of the other are in effect *the same*. This is Nonsense indeed; but 'tis *his own*, not the Dr's. “ Whereas a good Conscience would produce these Comforts it self.” I answer, First, There could be no *good Conscience* at all, without the Holy Spirit, because no *good Works*: And so the Comforts consequent upon a good Conscience may be properly called the Comforts of the Holy Spirit, to whom that good Conscience is owing. Secondly, Besides the *natural* Comforts of a good Conscience, there may be, and without doubt are, the *supernatural* ones of the Holy Spirit. And as He is distinguish'd by the Name of the *Comforter*; ALL spiritual Consolations, of what Kind soever, are properly ascrib'd to *Him*. “ So that he affords the *Holy Ghost* no other than an unnecessary Office.” No such Matter; as I have just now shewn. “ A true Divine would place the Office, and Power of the *Holy Ghost* antecedent to a good Conscience, not after it:” Both; if you please. What follows to the end of the Page is fully answer'd already.

P. 23. " As this is the utmost the Dr.  
 grants, and since he acknowledges *no farther*  
 about the Holy Ghost, &c." What  
 a Calumny is this! Because the Dr. in *this Passage* mentions but *one Thing* concerning  
 the *Holy Ghost*, having no Occasion to  
 mention any more; and that too only by  
 the Bye, and in a Parenthesis; therefore  
 this is the *utmost* he grants, he acknow-  
 ledges *nothing farther*, concerning the Third  
 Person in the adorable, and ever blessed  
 Trinity, the *Holy Ghost*, the Comforter, the  
 Inspirer, the Sanctifier. Does he not in  
*this very Discourse* several times mention the  
*Grace of God* as necessary, nay in *this very Passage*, does he not say that *without it we can do no good Thing*; tho' Mr. S. takes  
 care to leave those Words out? He proceeds.  
 " Certainly he appears to know nothing of  
 " his *first Working*, his *Renewals*, his *ab- way independent Efficacy*, nor consequent-  
 " ly really believes any thing about it.  
 " This is Natural Religion all over, cloath'd  
 " with Words only *seemingly* of another  
 " Import. He may abuse the Methodists,  
 " and all the Dissenters" [Dr. T. has abus-  
 ed none of them, but has been, and here is,  
 very much abused himself] " as much as  
 " he pleases; but truly, when Ecclesiasti-  
 " cal Persons *seem* to believe, but do not  
 " verily believe, &c. such a Conduct must  
 " confirm *Deism*, &c." The Man was here  
 writing

writing about the *Holy Spirit of God*: But with what sort of Spirit he wrote, let any indifferent Person judge. There is not a Divine in Christendom, that has more zealously preached *Christ* in the strictest Sense, the absolute Necessity of Christianity as such, and as distinguish'd from *Natural Religion*, the Necessity of *God's Grace*, and the whole *Mystery of Godliness*, than Dr. *Trapp*: And this is well known to the World. Yet because he is not a *Calvinist*; this Man will not allow him to be a *Christian*. And the same is to be said of the main Body of the Establish'd Clergy. But because they are not *Calvinists*, must they needs be *Pelagians*, *Socinians*, or *Deists*? Who among us denies *Free Grace*, as consistent with *Free Will*, (the Denial of which latter destroys all Religion;) *Grace*, as a *supernatural Assistance*; or even *Justification by Faith* only stated and understood as it ought to be, according to the main Scope, and Tenor of Scripture; one Passage being compared with, and explain'd by another? This weighty Writer, however, is mistaken in thinking that our thirty-nine Articles are form'd upon the *Calvinistical Plan*: The Contrary is well known to learned Men; and has been abundantly proved by several of them. If the *Papists* and *Infidels* are employing THESE THEIR TOOLS to revive the *Quinquarticular Controversy* among

us, which has been dead, and bury'd these threescore Years (Bishop Bull having entirely put an end to it) and to set us at variance again about *Predestination, Justification, &c.* upon my Word, the Tools they work with will fail them; *Men of Learning* (as many of the old *Calvinists* were) are required for such a Task: The *Seagraves*; and the *Whitefields* will never do the Business.

P. S. This Writer of so great *Erudition, Modesty and Charity*, refers us to another Work of his own; in which, belike, he proves that our Bishops, and Clergy are *Novelists*, quite in the Wrong about the Sense of the thirty-nine Articles, or subscribing them against their Consciences. For my own Part, I assure him, I have read so much of his Writing (that is, this Pamphlet) that I will never read any more. I would only advise him, before he writes again, to learn common English at least: It would be too severe to impose any other Language upon him.

*F. F. N. I. S.*

(P. 8. l. 2. read Writers. P. 26. l. 23. read Righteous)